ED 024 735 UD 007 411

Education for the Culturally Disadvantaged: Proceedings of the National Conference on Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged.

South Central Regional Education Lab. Corp., Little Rock, Ark.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date [67]

Contract-OEC-4-7-062100-3074

Note-122p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.20

Descriptors-American Indians, Communication Skills, Compensatory Education, *Conference Reports, *Culturally Disadvantaged, *Economic Disadvantagement, Educational Needs, Educational Objectives, Educational Programs, Negroes, *Rural Areas, Rural Environment, Self Concept, Southern Citizens, Subculture

Identifiers-Appalachians, Delta, Ozarks

Contained in this volume are the major addresses and the comments by participants at a 1967 conference. The goals of the program were: (1) to develop insights about the Delta Negro, the non-reservation Indian, and the rural poor of the Ozarks; (2) to clarify and amplify the issues of self concept and communication skills; and (3) to stress the need for clear statements of behavioral objectives for compensatory early childhood education programs. (NH)

07411 E

ED 024735

UD 007 411

EDUCATION for the CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED

EDUCATION for the CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED

Proceedings of the

National Conference on
Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged

SCREL

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION
EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 004 411

Proceedings of the

National Conference on Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged

SCREL

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION
EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Prepared under Contract Number OEC-4-7-062100-3074
with the United States Office of Education.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Wiley S. Bolden, Atlanta, Georgia, is associate director for research for the Southeastern Educational Laboratory.

Dr. William T. Carse is associate professor, Counseling and Testing Center, at the University of Texas.

Dr. Harry Caudill, Whitesburg, Kentucky, is an attorney and author of "Night Comes To The Cumberlands."

Dr. Bernice Clark, Albany, New York, is with the Bureau of Reading Education at the University of New York.

Dr. Arthur W. Combs is professor of education, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Dr. Walter G. Daniel, Washington, D. C., is professor of education at Howard University.

Dr. Lawrence Davis, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, is president, Arkansas A M & N College, and co-chairman of the conference.

Mr. Siegfried Engelmann, University of Illinois, is a senior educational specialist at the Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, and co-director of the Bereiter-Engelmann preschool project.

Dr. Robert Hamblin, St. Louis, Missouri, is program director for the Central Midwest Region Education Laboratory.

Dr. Robert J. Havighurst is professor of education at the University of Chicago.

Dr. Kara Vaughn Jackson is professor of education at Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana.

Dr. J. B. Jones is dean of students at Texas Southern University.

Dr. Tish Jones is a resource specialist for the South Central Region Educational Laboratory.

Mr. William Wayne Keeler is president, Phillips Petroleum Company, Bartlesville, Oklahoma.

Dr. Jack Kough is the former executive vice president of Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois, and co-chairman of the conference.

Dr. Carlton L. McQuagge is dean of the School of Education and Psychology, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.

Dr. Patricia O'Reilly, Charleston, West Virginia, is project coordinator for the Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Dr. J. E. Peters, Little Rock, Arkansas, is a professor in child psychiatry at the University of Arkansas Medical Center.

PREFACE

Only a cursory examination of the compensatory education programs being implemented with funds provided by the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965 or the Office of Economic Opportunity suggests a very real need to establish valid objectives or expected outcomes of such programs. Many activities are being planned and conducted that bear little relationship to the basic problems of the children and, further, the statements of objectives contained in many program proposals are merely justifications for a certain set of procedures. Believing that clarification of the expected outcomes of such programs is essential to the improvement of compensatory education, on September 7 and 8, 1967, SCREL conducted a conference in Hot Springs, Arkansas, for the purpose of stimulating the development of more appropriate objectives for compensatory education programs for specific target populations.

To accomplish these objectives, the conference program was designed to:

1. Develop insight concerning the children in the three target populations — the Delta Negro, non-reservation Indian, and rural poor of Ozarka;
2. Clarify and amplify issues related to self-concepts and communication skills; and
3. Emphasize the necessity for developing well-defined statements of behavioral objectives for compensatory early childhood education programs.

Dr. Jack Kough, former Executive Vice President of Science Research Associates, and Dr. Lawrence Davis, President of Arkansas A. M. & N., were the co-chairmen of the conference. Through their efforts, and the early involvement of Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, the program was formulated and the services of an impressive list of conference consultants were obtained. Each of the papers contained in this report was presented to a group of nearly 200 especially selected participants who were provided ample opportunity for discussion. The papers were thought-provoking and the discussion sessions were lively. Letters received from participants for weeks after the conference, and personal comments of those in attendance, expressed the opinion that it had been the most valuable conference they had ever attended. Some excerpts of letters are:

> *I found this to be a most stimulating conference. The quality of the presenters was of particular note.*

> *It was a stimulating, challenging, and disturbing experience. It has provided me with some more clearly conceived questions which are already causing intellectual upheaval. I cannot say that I am happy about the experience you have caused to occur, but I can say that I doubt if I shall ever be the same.*
>
> *I personally found the program to be unusually well planned; and, as I reflect back, I feel a sharpened interest and broadened perspective of the mission of education.*

One cannot be committed to the concept of early childhood education and still hold to the traditional point of view that intelligence is a fixed, immutable entity — not susceptible to change. The basic premise of compensatory early childhood education programs is that — if the right kinds of educational or developmental opportunities are provided at an early enough age — the level of intellectual functioning of disadvantaged children can, in fact, be increased. Certainly two accomplishments of the conference were the affirmation of this concept, and the strengthening of the commitment of the participants to even greater efforts toward the objectives of improved self-concepts and basic communication skills of rural culturally disadvantaged children.

GWEN NELSON

Table of Contents

Program Participants
Preface
Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE — POVERTY SUB-CULTURES

The Faces of Poverty — Havighurst 1
Commentary One — Keeler 10
Commentary Two — Caudill 16
Commentary Three — Jackson 22

CHAPTER TWO — THE NEED FOR OBJECTIVES

Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged — McQuagge 27

CHAPTER THREE — SELF CONCEPT AS AN OBJECTIVE

Self Concept — Combs 36
Commentary One — Peters 54
Commentary Two — Jones 57
Commentary Three — Carse 61

CHAPTER FOUR — COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS AS AN OBJECTIVE

Communications Skills — Engelmann 67
Commentary One — Clark 86
Commentary Two — Daniel 88
Commentary Three — Jones 91

CHAPTER FIVE — LABORATORY PROGRAMS IN ACTION

Educating Rural Children — O'Reilly 93
Interpersonal Relations Within Schools — Bolden 98
Social Exchange Theory in Teaching the Disadvantaged — Hamblin 105

APPENDIX

Conference Participants 113
Board of Directors 114
Professional Staff 116

Chapter One

POVERTY SUB-CULTURES

THE FACES OF RURAL POVERTY

by

ROBERT J. HAVIGHURST

Poverty in a rural area is not the same thing as poverty in a city. For one thing, poverty is always a relative term. The poor are the ones at the bottom of the economic heap, whether they have TV sets or whether they are without shoes. Thus, the urban poor generally have somewhat higher real income than the rural poor. They generally have access to electricity, running water, bus transportation, city schools, and free health service clinics. The rural poor seldom have these material things, and they generally live a long distance from schools and health services. On the other hand, the rural poor generally live rather close to nature, which has some advantages for children.

The rural poor can be seen more clearly if we identify them by their regional location and their ethnic group membership. There are four main groups of rural poor.

A. White Anglo-Saxon people, mainly located in the Appalachian and Ozark mountains and the states of this region.
B. Spanish-Americans of the five Southwestern States, who live in rural areas and generally work as farmers and farm laborers.
C. Negroes of the Southern States, mainly residing on small farms.
D. American Indians, distributed throughout the country, but concentrated heavily in the Southwest. Most of them live on or near Reservation Lands.

Poverty is a convenient term which can be used to identify disadvantaged groups in a wealthy society. The poor minority in a wealthy and democratic society are clearly in a disadvantaged position, and they tend to confer disadvantages on their children.

Nevertheless, poverty is not in itself a disadvantage for success in school. Many boys and girls from "poor" families are doing very well in school, and will do very well in adult life, just as many youth of poor families have done well in the past.

But, as poverty decreases in an affluent society, the children of poor people have less and less chance of succeeding in life. They suffer more and more from the social disadvantages that are statistically related to poverty. To be "poor" in the society of today is more of a disadvantage for a child than it was in the society of yesterday.

Therefore, the children of families that are visibly poor are very likely to show visible disadvantages in their school work.

The correlates of poverty in the USA which are in themselves disadvantageous for school success are the following: (1) A restricted language used in the home. (2) Low level of education of parents and general lack of reading habits, reading skills, and reading materials in the possession of the parents. (3) Parents do not set an example of achievement through education. (4) Parents do not hold high educational aspirations for the children. (5) Residential neighborhood is mainly occupied by people who are like their parents in socioeconomic characteristics. (6) Poor health and inadequate health services reduce school attendance and reduce the vigor of school children.

Who Are the Poor In The USA?

Since the "New Deal" of the 1930s, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that "one-third of the nation are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed," there have been periodic attempts by one administration after another to reduce the amount of poverty in the USA. President Johnson's "War on Poverty" is the latest and grandest in terms of the financial resources applied to the reduction of poverty. In 1964, the President's Council of Economic Advisors defined the "poverty level" as $3,000 a year for a family and $1,500 for a single individual in terms of 1962 prices. Prior to that, the definition of poverty had been raised from time to time, as the real income of the American people increased and as their expectations increased. Thus, in 1904, Robert Hunter in his book, *Poverty*, used a figure of $460 as the annual income of a family with three children which was just at the poverty line. Taking variations of purchasing power of the dollar into account, Hunter's figure would amount to about $1,500 in 1967, compared with the $3,000 figure of the Council of Economic Advisors. Throughout the world the welfare economists who are concerned with defining the level of "poverty" have insisted that poverty is a relative concept, and must depend on the general standard of living of a society.

The U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare worked with the Census Bureau's statistics of family income and expenditure for 1963, and defined an "economy budget" which varied with the size of family and the residence of the family in the city, on a farm, or in a rural non-farm area. The poverty line was thus defined at $3,130 for a non-farm family of four. This flexible definition of the poverty line placed

34.5 million persons in poverty in 1963, or 18 percent of all persons in the country. Using this definition, 22 percent of children and youth aged 5-19 were below the poverty level.[1] This amounted to 12.5 million children in a 15 year age range.

The highest incidence of poverty is found among Negro children, with 44 percent; among rural children, with 28 percent; and in the South, with 32 percent. These and other data on the incidence of poverty among children and youth are shown is Table 1.

When region and rural-urban residence and color are taken into account, the rural Negro children of the South were the most disadvantaged group, with a 60 percent incidence of poverty.

Certain other ethnic groups that are small in numbers, but have a rather high incidence of poverty, are the Spanish-Americans of the five southwestern states, with approximately 35 percent "poor," and the American Indians with an estimated 60 percent. This estimate is very crude, since most Indian children live on reservations under rural conditions, where the meaning of "poverty" is quite different from what it is for the few Indians who live in the cities. The Puerto Ricans are recent immigrants to the northern industrial cities, especially New York City. A crude estimate shows that about 50 percent of Puerto Rican children in the northern cities are in families below the poverty line.

In order to compare the incidence of poverty among communities of various types, we have computed Table 2 from the U. S. Census Report for the 1959 family incomes of families with one or more children under 18 in 1960. This Table underestimates slightly the percentage of children from poor families, since the poorer families tend to have more than an average number of children. It is seen in this Table that the higher incidence of poverty is in the South and in the rural areas. However, the central cities of the 212 standard metropolitan statistical areas had about the same amount of poverty among white families as did the small cities of 2,500 to 50,000. The communities with least poverty were the "urban fringe" of the metropolitan areas, which are the suburbs of the big cities. Among non-whites, the central cities and the urban fringe had an approximately equal incidence of poverty, due to the fact that a number of metropolitan areas have some *de facto* segregated Negro working-class suburbs, and there had been very little movement of middle-income Negroes to the suburbs by 1960.

Education and Rural Poverty

Farm youth lag behind urban youth in education. Median educational level of farmers in 1960 was about the same as the median educational level of all U. S. adults is 1940. The Table below indicates regional and racial differences in the education of farm youth.

PERCENTAGE OF FARM YOUTH AGED 15-21 WHO HAD COMPLETED 8TH GRADE OR HIGHER, 1962

REGION	WHITE	NON-WHITE	TOTAL
South Atlantic	48	26	42
East South Central	59	26	52
West South Central	72	22	66

Median years of school completed in five low-income counties of Kentucky ranged from 7.2 to 8.2 in 1960 versus the U. S. average of 10.6. This is partly due to heavy outmigrations of farm youth who have more education.

Farm families whose education is low are very likely to be poor families. Bird[2] estimated that in 1959, the incidence of poverty was only 31 percent among farm families whose heads had 12 years or more of schooling, but was 57 percent in families where the head had less than eight years of school.

The Need for Migration[3]

"It is an accepted fact that migration is necessary to eliminate rural farm poverty. Migration may be to near or distant non-farm employment, but it must occur. Of the 100 farm youths reaching an age for productive employment, no more than 50 are needed to replace 'normal' exit of established farmers and leave a stable population. Furthermore, the number of farmers must decline to raise the income levels, which means that in most rural poverty areas at least 75 percent of farm youth reaching a productive age must leave the farm to make satisfactory progress toward solution of the poverty problems."

How well is the migrant from rural areas prepared for non-farm employment? Shannon[4] says that "when the rural-reared urban migrant is compared with urban-reared city dwellers, the rural-reared urban migrant is found in the lower status positions no matter what measures of status are selected."

Bowman and Haynes[5] state that when the problems of rural poverty areas spill over into urban centers, they often become greater. While the more educated leave low-income areas, these same individuals find themselves at a disadvantage in education and training in the urban areas.

Statistics consistently show a heavy reverse flow of migrants back to disadvantaged areas. This reverse flow, undoubtedly, is prompted in no small part by inadequate education and values inconsistent with smooth integration into urban society. Smith[6] reports that nearly half of the Indianapolis migrants whom he interviewed indicated they were dissatisfied to the extent that they were hoping or actively planning to return home after only a brief and unsatisfactory experience. The importance of cultural factors and educational quality is reflected in Smith's finding that among rural migrants with similar amounts of education, wages were higher for Northern Whites than for Southern Whites in Indianapolis. The same study revealed that several employers discriminated against Southern Whites from rural areas because high turnover rates made training economically infeasible.

A study of farm migrants to Des Moines by Bauder and Burchinal showed that farm migrants were lower in occupational status, income, and other measures of socioeconomic status in the city than were urban migrants and urban natives. But these differences were accounted for by lower educational levels among farm migrants. The implication of these findings is that cultural factors do not have a depressing effect on social and economic status over and above the educational quality when migrants are from commercial farming areas. The same cannot be said for urban migrants from underdeveloped rural regions.

A disturbing fact is that very large numbers of farm youth in poverty areas do not face the reality of opportunities in farming until their formal education is essentially complete. It is also a fact that among farm youth, those planning to farm have lower educational aspirations than those planning non-farm employment. This may be because the expected pay-off from education on a low-income farm is small.

Economists generally favor migration from depressed rural areas to other areas, mainly urban, where employment opportunities are better. For this goal, education is regarded as a useful instrument. Thus, W. B. Back[7] wrote, in 1957:

> Also, we do not know how to overcome the resistance of families with low income to moving to areas having higher income. Currently, public education is our publicly acceptable way of attacking the kind of value and knowledge problems existing in low income areas. I believe the major knowledge problem of people in areas of low income is limited preceptions of reality, and combined with this problem, is an image of reality skewed by the major beliefs and values of their culture. If we want a program to develop agriculture's human resources, increased public support of education in areas having low income may be the only feasible way to get the job done.

Nicholls[8] commented on the fact that a disproportionate share of rural poverty is concentrated in the South. He says, "Rural poverty in the South is community-wide and, because it has deep historical and cultural roots, tends to be self-perpetuating." He lists the key elements in the Southern way of life that have hampered economic progress as, (1) the persistence of agrarian values, (2) the undemocratic nature of the political structure, (3) the rigidity of social structure, (4) the weakness of social responsibility, and (5) the conformity of thought and behavior. The agrarian values embrace the soil as the best and "most sensitive" of vocations: agriculture, therefore, should have the economic preference and maximum number of workers. The result of these values, according to Nicholls, has been a lack of emphasis on education. For farm laborers and operators of the ubiquitous small farming units, the economic value of education was likely to be small. The value of education as a consumption good also appeared to be low. The result of this apathy was underinvestment in education and a retarding effect on progress that has not yet been overcome.

Commenting on education in East Kentucky, Bowman and Haynes say:

> Although there is good reason for believing that improvement of the regular school system and the levels of schooling attained may be the single most important policy goal for the future of East Kentucky, the push to raise the holding power of the schools has found little active mountain support. People lacking education and a knowledge of its importance in the job markets outside the mountains do not spontaneously attribute their ills to deficiencies in themselves. Only as the process of de-isolation moves ahead does education of local youth begin to be something on which a local politician can safely place major emphasis.

They go on to conclude that:

> To overcome thresholds of inertia and resistance, education . . . must touch all age groups; it must become a part of every aspect of life, until the hills are saturated with it. State foundation programs are not nearly enough. Such a multiple strategy could and should be supported by local and outside sources — the state, the federal government, foundations.

Incentives to Raise Educational Attainment

Tweeten proposes that rural students might be paid to attend school.

> Research attention is now being directed to school dropouts, but too little of this attention appears to be oriented to depressed rural areas, where the acute problem is unwillingness of individuals to receive enough education to compete successfully with better educated persons for jobs.
>
> An alternative to the often difficult task of changing the basic aspirations and motivation of dropouts is a direct monetary incentive. One procedure would be to place more emphasis on the financial and other benefits of education in counseling sessions. Another approach would involve payments to students.
>
> A research program would determine the impact of payments to students attending school. The compensatory rather than direct payment approach appears to be most promising. In the compensatory approach, high school and elementary students would be given 'research assistantships.' For example, even at the elementary school level, students might write reports (though naive) for a workshop on topics relating to local economic and social development. In high school, projects would be more sophisticated and might entail surveys of the community, job opportunities, and attendant skill and preparation required for jobs. The gain would not be in profound research findings by students, but rather would be in (a) financial inducement, perhaps geared to performance and need, to attend school, (b) greater awareness of economic opportunities at home and elsewhere, and (c) reorientation of values away from the local culture toward a more dynamic, commercial culture. The program could be integrated with a broader program of education

> for the community, with anyone receiving welfare payments being required to attend educational sessions. Also, parents of dropouts might have welfare payments reduced. Programs of vocational and general education through adult night classes might also be integrated with the preschool, elementary, and secondary programs — all oriented to create a community-wide educational effort and overcome the inertia of cultural conformity.
>
> In summary, the above research proposals are designed to fill several of the important knowledge gaps by applying education to problems of underdevelopment. Other research proposals can be suggested, some that would logically follow those above. The time is yet far off when the co-efficients of education, industry recreation, and outmigration activities can be placed in a linear programming model complete with area restrictions on capital and labor resources and used to compute the least-cost combinations of public policy for desired adjustments. Nevertheless, additional work such as the projects suggested can give a basis for crude budget estimates of public investment needed to bring specific adjustments.
>
> Some projects discussed above relate to programs that may not now be politically or socially feasible. Occasionally, however, economic feasibility provides momentum for political feasibility. It might be useful to have facts available from pilot studies for future consideration of alternatives that at this time are not considered politically expedient.

He concludes as follows:

> (1) An adequate education is a necessary although not always a sufficient condition for sustained social and economic progress in rural areas. Education is regarded as a catalyst in the development process, facilitating migration, local industrial development, and other mechanisms.
>
> (2) Youth in low-income rural areas lag seriously in education and training needed to farm or to compete effectively with other youth for available non-farm jobs.
>
> (3) An educational drive tends to be lacking in rural communities where poverty is prevalent. While limiting financial resources are responsible for some school dropouts, the basic problem is presence of attitudes inimical to educational attainment.
>
> (4) Education is a profitable economic investment for society. This conclusion applies to rural youth from poverty areas who have attitudes and education that permit smooth assimilation into the non-farm economy. It remains doubtful whether investment in education has a profitable economic payoff on the average for youth who remain in depressed areas. The social value of education as a consumption good and as a precondition for economic development may justify use of public funds for education even where direct economic gains are not large.

Government Programs for the Rural Poor

In 1966, the President appointed a National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, which will report at the close of 1967. No doubt a program of federal support of rural development will emerge from the report of this Commission. There will be a considerable expansion of government-insured loan programs for rural people, as well as more federal government support of education and welfare services to migratory workers.

One important new step will probably be federal support of multi-county planning and development projects. Essentially these will be rural community action agencies. The rural community will cover several counties and people will learn to think of themselves as citizens of a non-metropolitan region of several counties. They will set up vocational schools, regional libraries, and cooperative arrangements between school districts.

Small Schools in Rural Areas

One of the major handicaps to effective functional education in rural areas is the smallness of many of the schools — especially the high schools. In spite of a great deal of school consolidation, we still have 11,500 high schools with less than 750 enrollment. Out of a total of 18,500 public high schools with an enrollment of 11.5 million, the small high schools, under 750 in size, are attended by 22 percent of our youth.

Though there are many desirable features in a small school, as has been clearly and persuasively shown by Barker and Gump,[9] there are many serious drawbacks to a small high school in a rural area or a small town. Probably further consolidation is not the answer to the need in many places. Rather, there is need for cooperation among small high schools to provide courses and teachers which no one small school can afford. A variety of devices are now being suggested for such cooperation, such as the sharing of a teacher of a special subject among several schools, the transportation of students a long distance to a regional vocational school where they may stay in a dormitory and study intensively for several days at a time, sharing a good school library with the aid of a bookmobile.

[1] Orshansky, Mollie, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile." *Social Security Bulletin.* 28. January, 1965.

[2] Bird, Alan R., *Poverty in Rural Areas of the United States.* U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Agricultural Economics Report #63, November, 1965.

[3] Tweeten, L. G., *The Role of Education in Alleviating Rural Poverty.* U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Agricultural Economics Report No. 114, 1967.

[4] Shannon, Lyle, "Occupational and Residential Adjustment of Rural Migrants." in *Mobility and Population in Agriculture.* Ames, Iowa, Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment, 1961.

[5] Bowman, Mary Jean and Haynes, W. W., *Resources and People in East Kentucky.* Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1963.

[6] Smith, Elden D., "Non-farm Employment Information for Rural People." *Journal of Farm Economics,* 38: 813-827, 1956.

[7] Back, W. B., "Approaches to the Rural Development Program." *Journal of Farm Economics* 39: 281-4, 1957.

[8] Nicholls, W. H., *Southern Tradition and Rural Progress.* Chapel Hill, N. C., University of N. Carolina Press, 1960.

[9] Barker, Roger and Gump, Paul V., *Big School, Small School.* Stanford University Press, 1964.

Table 1.

CHILDREN LIVING IN LOW INCOME FAMILIES, 1965

Total number of persons aged 5-19, inclusive, in 1965 (all levels of income)	56 million
Negro	7.1 million
White	48 million
Other non-white	0.6 million

Percent of these children living in families with income below the "economy budget" of the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1963, was 22, with 12.5 million persons.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 12.5 MILLION "POOR" CHILDREN

	Percent of all "poor" children	Number (millions)
Urban: 20 percent of urban children	60	7.5
Rural: 28 percent of rural children	40	5.0
Color		
Rural white. 24% of rural white children are "poor"	31	3.8
Rural Negro. 60% of rural Negro children are "poor"	9	1.2
Regional Distribution		
South		
40% of rural Southern children are "poor" (62% of the rural "poor" in the country)	24	3.1
Northeast, North Central and West		
19% of rural children from these regions are "poor" (38% of the rural "poor" in the country)	16	1.9
Other Ethnic Subgroups which are Mainly Rural (counted as "white" in the figures given above)		
Spanish-Americans of the Southwest Assume 35% are "poor"	4.0	0.5
Indian children on, or near, Reservations Assume 60% are "poor"	0.8	0.10
Indian children *not* on, or near, Reservations Assume 80% are "poor"	0.3	0.04

Table 2.

PERCENTAGE OF "POOR" FAMILIES, BY REGION AND BY URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE*

		Percent of families with less than $3,000 income in 1959
Central Cities of SMSAs	White	10.5
	Non-white	35
Urban Fringe (suburbs)	White	6
	Non-white	32
Towns and Cities of 2,500 to 50,000 Population, not in SMSAs	White	13
	Non-white	57
Rural non-farmer	White	18
	Non-white	66
Rural farmer (Income below $2,000)	White	23
	Non-white	70
South	White	25
	Non-white	60
West	White	12
	Non-white	25
Northeast and North Central	White	11
	Non-white	34

*Families with one or more children under 18 years of age.

COMMENTARY ONE

by

WILLIAM WAYNE KEELER

Dr. Havighurst's discussion impressed me a great deal. There are many points for which I have been seeking answers, and looking for ways and means of accomplishing them. I've been involved in this rural poverty since 1944 and 1945 when I had a job training a group of Mexicans to go into a very advanced technology using the most modern refining equipment that any industry had at the time. In Indian work, I have followed the Cherokees in detail, and since 1949 I have followed Indians at large, as well as the Eskimos and the Indians of Alaska as a government employee on two different occasions.

I think that the problems Dr. Havighurst talked about are still with them. I don't see any fixed solution to them, but I do want to touch on some of the problems, particularly from the Indian standpoint, because that is the area in which I am most familiar.

One of the problems that I think the educator and the federal government has is understanding how to motivate Indians. I would like to tell a true story told to me by an Indian who lived in my little town of Bartlesville. At some stage way back there, he was among those young Indians who were sent away to school outside their home to an Indian school in Pennsylvania. On this particular occasion the coach of the school football team had signed a three year contract and looked forward with great anticipation to a wonderful season of football because he thought these Indians were muscularly developed and physically oriented and he had every reason in the world to anticipate a successful team.

However, his first year there was a dismal failure. He tried to get the boys to practice sitting up exercises but they just weren't interested. He wrote back to a friend of his that these Indians were lazy, indolent, and had no response whatsoever, and despite their fine physique just weren't doing a bit of good.

That summer, accepting the invitation of some of his students to come to Indian country, he went to live with an Indian family. Returning that fall, he thought he had a new idea. When the season started he took the boys out and told them what games they were going to play. He took them out to the edge of town and said, "Well, now boys, when you've caught four rabbits today your training's over." Away they went, just every which way. That team became one of the greatest teams in the nation that year, and one Indian, only a 158 pounder, became one of the all time great athletes of our country, Jim Thorpe. My point is that I think for the first time Pop Warner, who later became a very successful coach in our country, discovered that it takes different methods to motivate different people. That holds true in the case with Indians.

How simple it is to say that what the Indians need to do is to move in these areas where there is a big economy and their opportunities are going to be greater. That wouldn't even get to first base with a great number of our Indian people because they just don't have that motivation. The Indian is strong in his ideas and it was part of his religion, his way of life, that he didn't try to take any more than he needed. So here's the difference. He had another sublime idea and belief that the Great Spirit, as long as he could live in harmony with nature around him, was going to make a bed and do all these things for him. Well, I think that that may very well come about one of these days, but it isn't here today. The problem that the Indian is faced with is that he discovered the truth. For instance, the Sioux Indian would probably still be at war, but the government realized that if they were to bring the Sioux Indians to their knees and be able to control them, they were going to have to kill off the buffalo, and they starved them in this country by the thousands.

When you talk about Reservations and poverty and rural poverty, look at some of the Reservation tribes in the Dakotas who are tremendously poor. You have no concept. I have seen whole families, from the grandparents, if they were still alive, right down through the many children, crowd into an old one-room house trying to fit in. Maybe there was an old car out in the yard that some of them could sleep in. I can visualize different parts of the country I know where there was tremendous poverty. But I think one of the things that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had to do was to recognize that, instead of just being the custodian of Indian property, they had to start working on the development of the human resource. That program is just barely getting started. One can hardly tell the wheel is moving. The emphasis has now switched and I think they have recognized the problem of motivation to education is a tremendous one.

In Northeastern Oklahoma, we have Indians in rural areas who are not sending their children to school, and the teachers have very little interest in the problem. The Indians themselves began to talk to the educators. The Indian's education is largely under the State Educational Program where they have an Indian Division. We talked to them, and tried to get the teachers to actually go to the home of Indians and start there. It was an awful job.

Now, I say for the Negro, as I said for the Indian, and I can say for the Spanish-American; the government is never going to cure poverty. I don't think they can. They can give us some opportunities but we've got to do our part as people. From that standpoint, we discovered that we had to be holding meetings, too, in Indian country to enable the school teacher to go into these Indian homes. There just wasn't any precedent for this. This was in spite of the fact that in my own tribe we had 122 public schools in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma at the time it was dissolved. We had a higher rate of education per birth, females and males, and were teaching Greek, calculus, astronomy, and German, and many of the ways of the practical approach to advance education. Here again is the other real fundamental that we talked about, people, and I suppose that there are other races like this, but we are one that has this problem being so independent that in the final approach we just don't fit. We just can't seem to get with it. At a company meeting three years ago one of our top executives introduced me at that time and said, "Well, here's a guy that if we can just keep from traveling can be President."

I think that the real problem that we have as Indians is that for years the government never consulted us about programs, and that has added tremendously to our rural poverty. I remember when the government moved a whole lot of Indians out of the Grand Lake of the Cherokee area when it was built. Those people were moved out, they were given some other area, they set up houses and each Indian family was given registered Herefords. I'm in the cattle business. It would have been a wonderful thing had they offered me that opportunity. That wasn't what happened. They moved these people, and after they moved them, most of those Indians, by the first Christmas, had eaten those Hereford. What a waste of those fine registered Herefords.

There is a way to do things, but people have to participate. The move to encourage Negroes, Spanish-Americans, and Indians to do some of these things is going to be their salvation, because as they participate we can see some change. In that same area we started a similar program with some registered hogs. As these people raised the hogs, because they were participating and because it was their idea, that program was successful.

Many of the Indians lost their land during the guardianship program and don't have any. But in one area there has been government land held in trust for the Cherokees. It was some of those people who are in bad shape, having no industry and no possibility of jobs. One of the things that we realized was what you said about an 80 acre tract or 100 acre tract no longer being the answer. You had to have something else. You had to have a bigger unit, you had to have equipment, and there are many things they just didn't have. There have been successes, such as the school that we started with 15 students. It was very successful because those people, by and large everyone of them working, were actually going to increase the productivity of their Cherokee property. That example has been good enough that another 15 want to do it, and another 15 are going to start soon.

This is the Indian idea. The government is helping. The government is necessary in many instances to give aid. We couldn't have gotten all that equipment to train mechanics to maintain that kind of equipment had the government not helped us. These fellows are paid while they're going to school. It's another idea that you mentioned, and I think that it's a good idea if it results in training like that. One group is planning to go into drafting. The plastic plant is South Dakota was mentioned. Most of the Indian tribes are now looking at this idea of industrial development and are in various stages of moving in that direction. There is a new BVD plant going into operation in the Navajo country. The Pokies have an asbestos operation, one of the Apache groups has gone into tourism and done a tremendous job. I could go on and tell you about more of those programs starting.

I happen to be involved now in a program for Puerto Ricans. There are cases where people wandered aimlessly over the island because of no jobs and tremendous poverty. They went to San Juan and became slum dwellers. Then they learned a little English and thought the real land of promise was New York. They went there, and there were more problems. The federal government, recognizing this, was willing to exceed the "Operation Bootstrap" program, in which, instead of being taxed for a welfare check, people get a tax concession if they entice industry to locate in Puerto Rico. We're now involved in one of those programs down there. We expect to ultimately have some 33,000 employees and over 600 million dollars invested because of the tax advantage.

There have been efforts in the United States Congress to try that same type incentive in parts of the US. People should study that program. I'm not smart enough to tell you what it would do to our country — whether it's good, bad, or indifferent, but I'm telling you that it works. Where there is incentive, a free enterprise situation, and no government interference, business will expand and prosper. They'll beat a path to your door. There are several thousand businesses now going into Puerto Rico. A similar experience may be one of the answers in our disdavantaged areas.

In Alaska I observed a completely different lack of motivation in the Alaskan Indians and Eskimos. These normally independent people had been stifled by government restrictions on hunting and fishing and other areas of their livelihood. For example, goose hunting was illegal until after the migration season. These people depended on geese and were deprived of them by government restriction. To compensate for the loss of hunting and fishing rights, these people were placed on welfare. This only led to more problems.

A man with the Public Health Service told me this true story about the Eskimo. When that welfare check came in the only place they could get it handled was at the Post Office. This was also the local store and soda pop and candy were sold. The Eskimos spent the welfare money on sweets that ruined their teeth. What I am saying is that there are many things, in my opinion, that are going to have to change as far as Eskimos and Alaskan Indians are concerned to be able to eliminate rural poverty. We're going to have to find out what motivates Indians. We're going to have to recognize that each race has different problems with education, employment, and just budgeting time.

Back in Oklahoma, I took a bunch of Cherokee Indians out of the hills and put them on a work detail. They had to have a high school diploma. I took them over there and we were going to set the world afire, or so we thought. In the process of doing that, I found out something. Define doesn't mean the same thing to an Indian as it does to other people, and when you neglect to orient people, you miss the meaning entirely. The government started a few years ago with several relocation programs. They had two or three things wrong with that program. Basically the idea was good, because the Indians were literally in a starvation situation. But they had some real problems. One theory they used was that to get the Indian oriented quickly he had to be far away from his home. Far enough that he would be unable to get back there. Well, strangely enough, it worked just the opposite. As soon as they realized how far away they were, they seemed to all want to return immediately. That was a fundamental wrong. Another wrong was not giving the Indians an orientation. They moved them into areas where the women didn't know how to shop in the supermarkets. They had never lived in a home where they cooked on a gas stove. I could go on. There are all sorts of things, but that is one of the basic things that I think is real important.

Then I want to talk about another point that you didn't touch on exactly, but you make me think of it. In the average middle class home, the child has something. He's encouraged by his parent, and he's encouraged by performing successfully. He may not live up to his parents expectations, but he is encouraged. I think one of the biggest problems we have right now with minority races is that they have no experience with success.

In my town I was trying to find out why we didn't have more Negroes apply for work at our company. Being conscious of the social problems that we are having in this country, I wanted to know just what it was, and I found out. Among other things, a lot of the Negro youth there said, "Well, even if I got a high school diploma I couldn't get a job with that company, because they don't want me." I've talked in Atlanta, and Chicago, and many other places, with a lot of people about this attitude, and I find that the poor — and it doesn't just have to be the Negro, or the Indian, or the Spanish American — lack motivation. We're missing a tremendous tool when we fail to recognize the importance of trying to train people in having a little success, and if we can find out how to do this, we've got the ability to go far. I went with an oil delegation to Russia and one of the things that greatly impressed me there wasn't the Russian ideology, because I couldn't agree with it at all, it was the fact that they were able to take a bunch of those people, that the Czar had considered just so much flesh, and train them in rural success to become industrial giants. There's been a tremendous change. Here's results that they've trained to do one little job and do it successfully, and it becomes compounded into a tremendous thing.

I don't think that we in our schools have worked on that with many of the poverty groups, because they are almost what their image is — failures. They've already got three strikes against them, because they believe that there is no opportunity. If we, the educator, and the people who are working with this tremendous asset, this human resource, can find a way of getting a success pattern, it would be great.

One time I hired some Cherokees from over in the hills who hardly spoke English, and in this instance, I had the company at a disadvantage. They were short of help during the war, and were expanding operations to supply war materials. I got these Indians to come in because we were trying to find help anyplace. When these Indians came in we gave them a physical examination. They'd never had a physical examination, and incidentally that's quite a shocking thing to go through if you've never had one. After checking them, we gave them what our company called a Wunderlist Test. There were eight in the group, and only six scored at all and none scored over five. Our company had set 17 as a minimum score. I had the employee relations man explain to me, "We just don't know how to explain it, because these Indians looked like they were intelligent, but you know this is a test of intelligence, and they just didn't make it. In fact they are so far below that we can't even make an exception."

I was strong in my beliefs, because I knew every one of these fellows and I knew they were intelligent. I said regardless of the tests we've got to have these people in our plants. We hired them. I'm very happy to say that 50 percent of them are now supervisors in a complicated chemical operation in Houston, and they couldn't do if if they weren't basically intelligent. But, here again, I'm getting off on the Indian. One of the things that makes it tough for the Negro to get started, especially a Negro girl, is that she may have learned a skill such as typing, but the excitement of going into an alien environment makes her fail when she really isn't a failure.

Somehow, if we could find a way to get these people oriented to do a job and they knew that they could be successful we'd find a tremendous change. A lot of the industrial leaders of the country are recognizing that we have a social problem. I don't think they recognized that for a long time. I've had people tell me that there is no Indian problem in Oklahoma. I can tell you that I am real proud of my Cherokee heritage and I didn't know that we had a tremendous Indian problem in the Cherokee Country. But we had and we have problems with all minority groups. We've got them in many many ways, and we're going to have to find solutions. I would hope, from an Indian standpoint, that they aren't forced solutions. We must learn the things that motivates us. And, too, we must recognize that because cultures differ we've got to have some kind of conditioning along with motivation so pressures are minimized.

COMMENTARY TWO

by

HARRY M. CAUDILL

It is altogether proper that the National Conference on Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged should give attention to the problems of Appalachia and the Ozarks. Many careful students have opined that the southern hill people dwell in a culture of poverty which perpetuates backwardness and indigence generation after generation. In many respects the Appalachian highlanders and the Ozarkans are quite similar. Many, perhaps most, of the latter are descended from people who migrated out of Appalachia generations ago.

Arnold Toynbee, the foremost historian of our time, has condemned the Appalachian subculture in the following scathing terms:

> The Appalachian mountain people are, today, little better than barbarians. They have relapsed into illiteracy and witchcraft. They suffer from poverty, squalor, and ill health. They are the American counterparts of the latter day white barbarians of the Old World — Rifi, Albanians, Kurds, Pathans, and Hairy Ainus. But whereas these latter are belated survivals of an ancient barbarism, the Appalachians present the melancholy spectacle of a people who have acquired civilization, and then lost it.

Toynbee thinks the Apallachian subculture presents a serious threat to western civilization. Others argue that there is no Appalachian subculture or culturally disadvantaged people in the hills. For my own part, I am certain there is a distinctive hill culture, that it grew out of the region's history, breeds poverty, is backward looking, and is extremely tenacious and enduring.

The Appalachians are a labyrinth of winding creeks and narrow valleys. The land is heavily forested, and when first settled was a gigantic and unbroken woodland.

The people who migrated into it were, in the main, backwoodsmen. Most were veterans of the Revolution. They were hardy Indian fighters and had been involved in wars for a third of a century. Most were North Americans whose ancestors had been here a generation or more. They brought with them the customs, mores, attitudes, prejudices, strengths, and shortcomings engendered by harsh frontier conditions.

They were great specialists at land conquest — driving out the Indians, killing off the game, establishing trails. They were the keen cutting edge of the westward moving scythe which sliced all the way to the Pacific in less than a century.

They were loners. Typically a family took up its residence on an isolated creek. There they lived for decades with practically no contacts with anyone else. The family repeated the experience of the Swiss Family Robinson. In their isolation they had to be self-sufficient. Each man had to be his own doctor and minister. He could know only what he learned from experience and from his parents and grandparents.

They brought with them a primitive system of agriculture learned from the Indians. The land afforded an extremely tenuous agricultural base. The valley bottoms, though rich, were narrow. The hillsides were covered with black loam but were steeply sloping. The "new ground" agriculture quickly wore out the land. The people, knowing nothing about any other mode of farming found themselves is an agricultural blind alley with doom ahead. Forty years ago they began to starve. Unable to live from the land, they migrated or passed onto the relief rolls in immense numbers.

Long isolation and self-sufficiency instilled in them an unyielding traditionalism. They became backward looking people. No Jews, Italians, Rumanians, Hungarians or Greeks reached the valleys of Appalachia until the mining era began and then only a handful of counties were affected. The later migrations added immense color and strength to other parts of America. But in the southern hills the old pattern of thought and action persisted. They continued in the old traditions, convinced that what was good enough for their forefathers was good enough for them.

There were supremely individualistic. There had been few people to crowd in upon them. The mountains shouldered out other people. They lived by their own standards and their own norms. Their habits and outlook did not encourage cooperative efforts. They were loners and continue so to this day.

The Indian Wars, the ruinous devastation wrought by the Civil War, the bloody family feuds that convulsed the mountains for many decades, the terrible toll in flesh and lives exacted by logging and mining gave rise to a marked fatalism. The people do not believe they control their own destinies and their fatalism has given rise to passivity and resignation.

From the beginning the highlanders fostered a deep distrust of government. When he got around to creating governments of his own he made them weak. He made his state government weak by constitutional limitations and divided the power to act among a host of counties. He reserved all power to the people and then failed to educate his sons and daughters. Surely the most archaic and ineffective counties in America are within Appalachia and they have been so historically. For example, Floyd County Kentucky, established in 1804, required sixteen years to build a court house. Mountaineers burned it down the day after it was finished.

There are counties today in eastern Kentucky, the heart-land of Appalachia, that collect less money in taxes than are required to pay the salaries of their elected officials.

Another ruinous factor at work in Appalachia is absenteeism. Toward the end of the last century the gigantic wealth of the region was discovered by huge economic interests in the east and in Europe. They bought up the vast deposits of coal, oil, gas, limestone, and iron ore at prices ranging from ten cents to a few dollars per acre. They extracted this natural wealth on terms which paid practically nothing to the Appalachian people except the most meager wages. Long ago they were able to "fix" the governments of Appalachian counties and states.

Their activities were never equitably taxed. Today more than 90 percent of the mineral wealth is owned by people who reside completely outside Appalachia. Consequently, we have many incredibly poor people dwelling in a fantastically rich land. A more or less typical county is Perry in eastern Kentucky. It has the world's biggest coal auger, and one of the world's finest seams of steam coal. It produces millions of tons of coal annually for TVA, yet pays only eight percent of the cost of running its schools — enough to keep them going only three months out of the year.

The fatalism of the Appalachian people is deepened by the fact that the absentee owners in their offices in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York have far more influence with governors and legislators than do the mountaineers themselves. As a people, the hillbillies have sold their land and birthright to outlanders and then established weak governmental institutions to protect their exploiters.

And the hillbilly has fled from the mess he has made. The out-migration began after the Civil War and has quickened with each generation since. One doubts that it could ever proceed at a rate faster than was witnessed during the past decade. My home county of Letcher in Kentucky has lost half its people since 1945. Harlan County, Kentucky declined from 85,000 to 38,000 in 15 years. Leslie County, Kentucky went from 20,000 people to 10,000 people in a single decade. This pattern has been repeated in southwestern Virginia, in the hills of Tennessee, all across West Virginia and in Alabama and Georgia.

This sustained out-migration is robbing the region of its brains and its strong hands. In Hamilton County, Ohio 85 percent of the school teachers are immigrants from Appalachia.

The sustained out-migration is doing things to the genetic stock. In one Appalachian county a few years ago, the school superintendent told me that of the 87 high school graduates produced the previous spring all had departed to a distant state before the beginning of a new school term three months later.

In some counties the intelligence quotient of the school children, as measured by standard tests, has been declining from one-quarter to one-half point annually for 13 years. In one small rural school the highest score achieved on such an IQ measurement was 91.

Many factors have combined to cripple the Appalachian people. According to a recent, careful medical survey, there are more than 70,000 totally disabled men suffering from silicosis and pneumonconiosis caused by mining and quarrying. Thousands of others have been disabled by sustained malnutrition.

The region never had really good schools. Appalachia has the highest rate of white adult illiteracy in America and most of the remaining one- and two-room school houses. In eastern Kentucky 24 percent of the adults over 24 years of age are illiterate.

Poor schools produce uneducated people with poor skills who earn low wages. Low earning power begets a weak tax base which, in turn, supports weak public institutions. These weak institutions produce more poorly trained people and so the cycle is repeated generation after generation. The only alternative to starvation has been public assistance, and the welfare rolls have ballooned. In some counties a third of the people passed onto the welfare rolls — aid to the blind, to dependent children, to the totally disabled, to the aged. Breathitt County, Kentucky boasts the dubious honor of having more of its people on public assistance than any other county in America.

The mountaineers are in flight but at every opportunity stream back again. From Indianapolis, Hamilton, Cleveland, and Chicago they return, often in ancient battered cars. They come back to the little cemeteries, to the decrepit shacks, to the "old folks." They love the hills and valleys, the friendly contours of earth and sky, and no matter how long they live in another setting they always think of themselves as mountaineers, abhorring the title of hillbillies which urbanites often pin on them.

They do not assimilate easily into other communities because they think of themselves as temporary sojourners. They plan to go home again and, once settled in a white ghetto in Chicago, seldom register to vote or join any community betterment effort. The mountaineer remains a man from Lost Creek and, if the opportunity to return does not present itself quickly enough, he takes French leave and goes home for a week or a month — much to the consternation of his employer. Thus in the labor market he accumulates a reputation for unreliability while simultaneously assuring his political impotence. Thus he is looked down upon by the "power structure" with more scorn than is heaped on the Negro.

If Toynbee's highlanders are to be rescued, we must build in the mountains an educational system that will reach and inspire them, eroding away the attachment to barren tradition, fatalism, and in some measure at least, their stubborn individualism. They must be taught to think and work cooperatively in seeking cures for the region's ills.

Education must do more than teach children in the classrooms. It must restructure society, prevent civil war and insurrection, and build a truly Great Society. The responsibility that has fallen on the educator is of crushing magnitude — the gigantic task of preserving America. The culturally disadvantaged Negroes, poor whites in Ozarka, Appalachia, and southern backlands generally, the Mexicans of the southwest, and the Puerto Ricans — are increasingly restive. The mass media tantalizes them with goods they cannot buy. They are saddled with archaic attitudes, mores, and traditions which effectively prevent them from earning the money required for participation in the national affluence. Thus society dangles before them all kinds of enticements while simultaneously withholding them. Hence a steeply climbing crime rate and a staggering eruption of class violence. It may well be that by this time next year the white and Puerto Rican ghettos will erupt like volcanoes alongside the Negro slums.

Recently a white woman newly returned from Detroit sat in my office and told me about the riots which she witnessed: "Mr. Caudill, they ain't told the truth about the riots. I could see the riots from my winder in Dee-troyt. And I can tell they was nearly as many white people mixed up in 'em as they was niggers. Now, where I lived I was just across the street from a whole section of town that was lived in mostly by black folks. When the rioting started down the street, the whites in my section — and they was mostly people from Kentucky and West Virginia and Tennessee — got out and crossed the street and broke into a big furniture store and starting carrying out televisions and refrigerators and shot guns and everything you can think of. And while they was doin' that, a bunch uh niggers down the street saw 'em and come chargin' down on 'em an one big nigger yelled, 'Let's beat the hell out of these hillbillies! They're up here trying to take our jobs away from us!' I thought, 'Lord have mercy, Lester is down there and he's got a pistol, and he'll kill one of 'em fur shore."

"But, you know, they didn't have any trouble after all. A white man from Tennessee said to the niggers, 'Now, dammit to hell, don't come down here and jump on us! We'll help you burn the damn place down.' And the first thing you know, they all went back into that store and carried out whatever they wanted, and then they carried out a whole lot of furniture and piled it up in the middle of the street and set it a-farr!

A couple of poleeces come by in a car and looked at 'em, but they was so many that the cops didn't do anything. They just drove on. But anyways, a lot of people have had to come back here from Dee-troyt because the poleeces got their pictures. And I ain't agoin' back to Dee-troyt no more because, to tell you the truth, they'll burn the whole place down one of these days."

Here in the words of an illiterate white woman — a hillbilly who had been uprooted by a dreadful depression in the coal fields and forced into a white urban ghetto, then routed again by massive riots — we have prophecy. Unless solutions are found for the agonizing problems of the culturally disadvantaged — solutions spanning the entire spectrum of our national life — the poor and frustrated may indeed "burn the damn place down." And in quenching the fires of hate thus loosed, the whole house of Democracy could be shattered.

COMMENTARY THREE

by

KARA V. JACKSON

Each time the recent American war on poverty, with its popular thrust, is people-oriented, three faces appear simultaneously on the scene. Public attention is called especially to the plight of three groups of Americans — the Indian, the Ozarkan-Appalachian (poor whites), and the rural Negro. Assessment of the efforts and environmental press to eradicate poverty by federal, state, and local governments as it relates to the rural Negro sets in motion numerous dynamic conditions in education. In my judgment, this conference designed to focus on objectives for the culturally disadvantaged has pointed up two significant milestones and given specific directional signs for educating the rural Negro. To attack scholarly the urgent need for improving the self-concept and the basic communication skills or personal effectiveness among rural Negroes, with emphasis on the early years of development, rates very high as an appropriate present day approach to the problem.

The rural Negro is truly one of the three faces of poverty. Just being a Negro involves an inferior status. Uppermost in our minds is the loud claim for a superior status by and for the Negro. Throughout the history of America as if "by divine right" a black complexion has denoted the absence of that divine spark known as the human soul. It was Louis XIV who declared that God's image could not be black therefore, no black man was created in the image of God but only in the image of man. Therefore, he was only an animal with sub-human attributes of hands, feet and the power of verbalization. Such ideas as "one drop of black blood makes a man black" were written into state constitutions of America's deep south region. Today, the advocates of "black power" theory have made it impossible for Americans to escape being involved in a theory which is in direct opposition to the three hundred year old declaration of Louis XIV. Between two declarations poses the self-concept trap.

It becomes our task as educators to find ways to deny and destroy the conscious or unconscious beliefs held by all the races of mankind, including the Negro, in the inferiority of the Negro. Likewise, it becomes our task as educators to face realistically the truth about the rural Negro.

The rural Negro child suffers from a disbelief in himself that is so real and so severe that his teachers have great difficulty in getting him to exercise his abilities to achieve the skills needed for effective living in an urban technological society. When compared with his urban counterparts, the rural Negro pupil has achieved less in school. He is less motivated and displays less ambition. He drops out of school earlier. Aspirations and attitudes are damaged and distorted in early childhood when one is born a Negro, born poor, born in rural areas. The damage to ego development and the lack of self-esteem, when examined scholarly and carefully, is invariably traced to what can be referred to as rural-racial rejection.

It was Gunnar Mydral who a quarter of a century ago stated: "The feeling of inferiority kills ambition and makes low standards of morals and accomplishments seem natural for Negroes." Negroes don't particularly like this statement, but we accept unchallenged a statement made by the late President Kennedy in a message to the U. S. Congress on February 28, 1963:

> The Negro baby born in American today — regardless of the section or state in which he is born — has about one-half as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance as becoming employed and earning $10,000 per year, and a life expectancy which is seven years less and the prospects of earning only half as much as the white baby.

Both you and I sense and feel the quiet revolution underway to give the Negro baby born in America today a more even chance with the white baby. But this assignment has forced me to review today's facts and statistics about the rural Negro. Allow me to review some of the findings on the South Central Region which is served by this Educational Laboratory. Through years of direct experience with the rural Negro, farm and non-farm, living in the Delta country from West Memphis to New Orleans, I am presumptuous enough to speak authoritatively on his condition. Recall that I am describing for you a segment of the population which is Negro, and also a majority. My concern, however, is not politically inspired. I dramatize the plight of the rural Negro in the South Central Region because I feel so keenly the responsibility of the school to meet the challenge of social injustice which he presents.

The Rural Negro —

— is desperately poor
— his income is indecently low
— malnutrition is widespread
— starvation is not unknown
— his home is in need of repair; he lives in some homes beyond repair
— his education level is as low as his income level
— if willing and able to work, he can't find a job
— if unable and unwilling to work, he meets condemnation rather than motivation and direct help
— the very old and the very young relatives, friends and neighbors live together in shabby farm houses making an acute dependency

problem for the salaried or wage earners who migrated to the towns, villages and "Central American City"

— public assistance is too often unavailable to the rural poor

— birth rate is high; 6.4 per non-white mother as compared to 3.7 per white mother

— knows very little about family planning; hindered by tradition and religion

— few traditional jobs available to him in agriculture, foresty, fishing and mining

— possesses no skills to do the jobs available to him in service occupations, manufacturing and construction

— has little access to schools which prepare workers for job opportunities in urban areas.

— poor transportation

— few avenues to health efficiency

— lacks leadership ability

This sample of the plight of the rural Negro is aggravated by his communication system with the world outside of his limited physical environment. Chances are that he has a television set, but he avoids the intellectual stimulation, and thrives on that which disrupts his emotions. With only a fifth grade education, the older rural residents are unable to provide a stimulating intellectual environment for the very young children. So together they are trapped by the theory of "black power" on one hand and the luxuries of "white superiority" on the other, and never the twain shall meet in this vacuum of basic skills of communication, such as thinking, listening, reading, writing, and the like. Until the intervention of our compelling mass media communication system, rural people, white and Negro, were content to exist, but now we will have to admit that we really don't know how the rural Negro thinks and feels. Educators must sharpen their tools for finding answers to these questions:

Is the rural Negro without hope?

What is his picture of his future?

What is the nature of his sense of values?

Is he fatalistic or merely pessimistic?

What is his attitude toward education?

Does he believe in self-help or is he content to depend on the social system to rescue him from his poverty?

Does he understand thrift, saving, protection against loss of life, property?

Does he take his pleasure immediately if and when available?

What is operating subconsciously when the rural Negro is in a state of emotional depression?

What is operating subconsciously when the rural Negro is in his peak periods emotionally?

Will the rural Negro wait patiently for food, health services, housing, clothes and education, or is he demanding that the society in which he lives do something more about his poverty condition today?

It may take years for some to find accurate answers to the questions I have raised. Until then we must learn better how to apply what we already know about the challenge to be found in the lessons of history. "Humility" and "determination" are two terms I would submit for your consideration. We have too long given lip-service to terms like "dedicated." One could be dedicated to the achievement of dead-end goals, colored by personal gains. And you may ask what is appropriate about such a goal in a democratic society, and to this question I would have many answers which would confuse rather than clarify. My chosen way out of the chain of thoughts I have no doubt generated will be some lessons from history.

What have the conditions of legal slavery, emancipation, prejudice and discrimination, physical and cultural differences done to all of us? Legislation to bring about inequality as well as equality is not a newcomer. Beginning in 1890, many Americans became very concerned about voting privileges, separate but equal doctrines, public accommodations, opportunities for education and employment, elimination of race, color, creed, Fair Employment Practices, Civil Rights for minorities and the like, but the rural Negro remained in an inferior status.

A little more than a decade ago came the Supreme Court Decision ruling against school segregation. The portion of it to be considered in depth by educators states:

> To separate Negro children from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race, generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.

At this point, I raise a question for dialogue in the group discussions to follow. "Have the hearts and minds of all children been affected in a way almost unlikely ever to be undone?" It seems to me that we must be able to admit that something other than the accepted rationale such as today's unequal educational opportunities, poor housing, family breakdown, unemployment — all of these elements of poverty, prevent children's progress. Against this background teachers must help all children with their self-concepts.

Margaret Anderson, a Tennessee school teacher, has written a book, *The Children of the South,* on the bombing and rebuilding of a schoolhouse in Clinton, Tennessee in which she states:

> The Negro child is different from other children because he has problems that are a product of a social order not of his making . . . The road

> for him is three times as hard as for the average white child, even the poorest white child. At every turn there is an obstacle and forever and ever the Negro child must ask himself why.

To understand the enormous effect and damage these obstacles I have thus outlined have had on the Negro child's personality, we must view the personality of the rural Negro child as his inner and outer adjustment and adaptation to his social environment. As teachers we are no more free from rural and racial prejudices then any other group in America, but we do our damage when we reinforce the feelings of inferiority and the lack of determination to achieve in Negro children. Who among this audience is completely free of the belief that Negro children are intellectually inferior, that they are incapable of benefiting from a normal curriculum?

In closing, you have a right to demand of me more specific take-home ideas. Let me then suggest that our schools try a more comprehensive curricula:

Is anyone present offering a unit or a course in urban living?

What is the content of vocational education? Is it more job skills than
    a. literary skills
    b. human relations skills

Is family life education left to the Home Economic teachers one unit which emphasizes budgeting an income which rural Negroes have not?

Who teaches sex education, marriage, family planning — When is it taught?

What takes place in the school's program or what is found in textbooks about the Negro's cultural contributions to American life?

Finally, let us take heed of the fact that a growing segment of the American population is abandoning the public schools. Why? How can an American child in tracks systems gain realistic and adequate self-concepts to enable him to cope with the emerging system of democratic living? Just as we accept the fact that together rural and urban America must eradicate the three faces of poverty, we must accept the fact that together the races of America must solve all of America's problems.

Chapter Two

THE NEED FOR OBJECTIVES

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES FOR THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED

by

CARLTON L. MCQUAGGE

The topic "Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged" has generated great interest and wide differences of opinion during the last three years. It has given rise to many difficult questions in the educational world, and generated a number of issues. Harry L. Miller, editor of the book *Education for the Disadvantaged,* says that:

> Among the many rapidly advancing specialized fields in education none equals that of education for the disadvantaged in the concentration of interest it has aroused professionally and among the public . . . One of those debates currently deals with the question of whether the schooling of children disadvantaged by economic and social circumstances should be considered a separate area of specialization within education or a broad problem within each of the presently established areas of interest.

If the schooling of this group is to be considered a special field of education, a set of objectives peculiar to their needs will be called for; however, if their schooling is a problem within presently established areas of interest, then the same educational objectives will serve both the advantaged and disadvantaged groups. The burden of this paper is to deal with this issue.

Before considering the issue it seems essential that we deal with the burning question "Who are the culturally disadvantaged?" The answer to this question is in itself a difficult one and to a considerable degree seems to depend upon the individual attempting to answer it. If culture is thought of in respect to the particular customs, mores, traditions, attitudes and behavior patterns of races or nationalities we find many cultures and sub-cultures in America. Within each of such cultures or sub-cultures will be a large number of disadvantaged individuals, more in some groups than in others; however, this use of the term culture does not seem adequate for our purposes. Instead of thinking of the culturally disadvantaged in terms of nationalities or races I want us to think of culture as improvement or refining of the mind, taste, manners, and attitudes by education and training. In light of this definition the culturally disadvantaged would be any individual regardless of race, nationality, color, or creed who for some reason has not developed his capacities to the point of being able to live a satisfying and effective life and of making a contribution to the society in which he finds himself. In this context the culturally disadvantaged may come from any level or strata of our society, from the so called upper classes to the lower classes, and also from any race or nationality of people which may constitute a sub-culture within the American culture. It is recognized that most of the culturally disadvantaged come from the so called lower classes and that much of the literature in recent months has been directed at what has been termed the poverty group. Thus the topic "Educational Objectives for the Culturally Disadvantaged" is considered from the point of view that the objectives ultimately must be for any disadvantaged child and not for some specific sub-culture such as the Negro, Mexican, Indian, poverty stricken, or any other specific group.

The topic as stated implies a need for a set of educational objectives specifically directed to the so called culturally disadvantaged group. The insistence on a set of educational objectives for this group also implies that the current educational objectives for public education in America are not appropriate objectives for the culturally disadvantaged. The issue therefore seems to pivot around the question "Are the current educational objectives appropriate for the culturally disadvantaged group?" If not, the need for a specific set of educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged group means establishing two sets of educational objectives in American education. Would this be sound educational practice? The topic implies a need for a set of broad general educational objectives such as stated in the Seven Cardinal Principles in 1917 or by the Educational Policies Commission in 1946. Can such a need be established?

An examination of literature on education for the disadvantaged reveals that many of the writers, at least by implication, seem to feel that there should be a set of educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged. Other writers take the position that there should be no difference in the educational objectives for boys and girls in American schools; consequently, it seems that the question we are now trying to determine is whether or not there is a body of evidence that would support the contention for educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged.

At this point let us take a brief look at the principles on which free public education in the United States came into being. There was a time in the history of our country when education was for a select group of individuals who not only had the mental capacity of pursuing education but also had the financial ability to purchase this education through the academies, colleges, and universities of that era. As America grew and education proved its worth to an individual, our forefathers arrived at the position in their thinking that if education was good for a few individuals it also had tremendous value for all individuals and consequently should be made available to them. Out of this thinking grew two fundamental principles with respect to education in this country. These principles are: (1) equal educational opportunity for all individuals and (2) that this education should be provided in a democratic framework and through a democratic process. These two great ideals have become firmly established in the roof and warp of American culture and I find no evidence on the part of the great masses of people of wanting to abandon them with respect to education in America. In fact, one encounters the argument frequently in the literature that the reason we have the large number of culturally disadvantaged people is because these two ideals have not been implemented. I believe that we all agree that we have failed miserably in providing equal educational opportunity throughout this country and that much of the education we have provided has not been in the democratic framework and process; however, I do not feel that our failure to live up to these two ideals provides sufficient grounds for our abandoning them. The problem seems to be not one of abandoning these two great ideals but one of our taking them more seriously and developing genuine and dedicated efforts to implement them so that every individual will have the opportunity for developing himself or herself to the fullest extent possible. The educational goal of society for all children should be maximum development of each individual as a person by providing him the opportunity for development through the educational process. This goal is consistent with the widely held and generally accepted, but poorly implemented, American philosophies of equal educational opportunity and democracy in education. It makes no distinction between the culturally disadvantaged and the culturally advantaged which is, I believe, as it should be. If we accept the goal as stated above, then it follows that we can continue to accept the educational objectives as stated by the Educational Policies Commission in 1946. They are not in conflict with this goal, but actually implement it. These objectives are (1) self realization, (2) human relationships, (3) economic efficiency, and (4) civic responsibility. One is able to find a considerable body of evidence to support this position. The Educational Policies Commission in its 1965 publication *American Education in the Search for Equal Opportunity* states on page seven:

> The goals of education for the disadvantaged are not different from those of other American children. The goals are to enable each child to play constructive, respected role in society and to lead a lift which to him

> will be satisfying. Any school must therefore know its pupils well enough to offer each child a program appropriate to him.

In this same vein Dr. Ralph W. Tyler in his address to the National Conference on the Education of the Disadvantaged held in Washington, D.C. July 18-20, 1966, stated:

> That learning which is important for more fortunate children is the aim for those who are disadvantaged. The path to reach this goal and the rate of progress may be different, but we shall not be satisfied until we have devised ways by which all children may become lifelong learners.

Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, in his address to the National Conference on the Education of the Disadvantaged said:

> The ideal, of course, is an educational system that will train rather than chain the human mind; that will uplift rather than depress the human spirit; that will illuminate rather than obscure the path to wisdom; that will help every member of society to the full use of his natural talent. The desire to bring the reality of education closer to the ideal is here as it has always been, but the gap between the two is better perceived and defined, I believe, than ever before.

Let us assume for the moment that a set of general educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged should be established and examine the possible effect of such a set of objectives. If we had different educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged as distinguished from the culturally advantaged, then society through the educational process would be saying to one group of individuals, you should have this kind of education to prepare you for one kind of life, and to another group, another kind of education to achieve another set of objectives. This kind of practice we find in many European countries and have condemned it as not being democratic and have rejected such an approach to education in America. Why move in this direction because a large segment of our people have not received the kind of education they need and should have received. Too, a movement is this direction would be another kind of differentiation of the culturally disadvantaged from the culturally advantaged. This practice would result in a form of discrimination which brought the problem into focus in the first place.

The culturally disadvantaged have been identified as being different, and this action on the part of the American public has caused them to view themselves as inferior and not accepted. Panel 1-A Conferees of the National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged in 1965 rejected suggestions that separate schools or school systems be created to deal with special problems of the disadvantaged. The poor already have experienced too much segregation they concluded and a separate system would do little or nothing to help them. It seems to me that to establish a set of general educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged would be another disservice to this group of people and would have the effect of perpetuating another form of discrimination against them which is the very thing we are trying to overcome; consequently, this approach to the problem does not seem to be a wise procedure to follow.

At this point, based on material I have presented, I seem to have destroyed my topic and reached a conclusion that the educational objectives as stated by the Educational Policies Commission are adequate for the education of both the advantaged and the disadvantaged and that a set of general educational objectives directed to the education of the culturally disadvantaged is not only unnecessary, but would result in harmful effects to this group of individuals. Consequently, the establishment of different educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged does not appear to be the answer to the problem. This being the case, I will at this point undertake to identify what I believe to be the problem and to examine some of the implications for the education of this group.

The basic question seems to be one of what is to be done educationally to achieve the Educational Policies Commission's objectives in the lives of the culturally disadvantaged. Monsignor Arthur J. Geoghegan, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, stated to the 1965 National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged that the problem appeared to him to be primarily an instructional one, but to deal with the education of the disadvantaged requires more than focusing on the individual as such. We must also focus on the home, the community, and environment from which the child comes.

If the literature agrees on anything with respect to the education of the culturally disadvantaged, it is that schools have not effectively dealt with the education of this group. We all have to agree with this. Then the question arises as to why we have been unable to cope with the education of the culturally disadvantaged effectively. The reasons here are probably many, but I wish to deal with three: (1) In the past schools have been basically organized and administered to meet the needs of a middle class white culture. (2) The culturally disadvantaged come into the school system with different kinds of problems from those of the culturally advantaged, and these problems are much more difficult to deal with than those of the culturally advantaged. (3) The gap between the culturally disadvantaged and the advantaged seems to widen as they move through school.

One only has to examine the history and development of public schools in America to realize the correctness of the statement, "the public schools, as we have known them, were developed by middle class culture for middle class white children." Under the ideal of equal educational opportunity for all, we have put into the public schools large numbers of culturally disadvantaged children and have expected them to perform successfully in these middle class institutions. Some disadvantaged individuals have achieved in these institutions, but large numbers have not. Harry L. Miller, editor of the book *Education for the Disadvantaged*, reports an experiment by Dr. David L. Rosenhan in which he hypothesized that a school is a middle class institution and, as such, was a direct extension of the middle class child's home. He argued that the middle class child felt comfortable in the school and was very likely appreciated and understood by his middle class teachers. The lower class child would likely feel more alienated from a middle class institution. For him it was not an extension of his environment; he did not look forward to attending; and the teachers might possibly be particularly hostile to his presence.

He reasoned then that identical reinforcements ought to have differential impacts according to whether the child was of lower or middle class origin. A lower class child ought to be much more responsive to approval from a middle class teacher than a middle class child for the reason that the former is more alienated and insecure in a middle class school situation. By the same reason he ought to be more disorganized by disapproval. The results of this experiment clearly confirmed the hypothesis. It made little difference to the learning of the middle class children whether they received approval or disapproval. For lower class children when they received approval their performance on the probability learning task was superior to that of the middle class children. When, however, they received disapproval even when that disapproval was quite appropriate in the sense that it conveyed information and was not intended to be hostile or vindictive, their performance was far below that of middle class children, so much so that one can argue that they never really learned the task. In addition to Dr. Rosenhan's experiment there seems to be enough other evidence in the literature to support the contention that disadvantaged children can hardly be expected to achieve successfully in schools organized and administered for middle class children.

The fact that the disadvantaged child brings problems to school different from those of the advantaged children is a widely accepted position by the writers. It is only fair to state that the schools have long recognized this problem but have not had the financial resources, the personnel, or the facilities needed to study the characteristics of these children and to develop programs suitable to their needs. In the case of the disadvantaged child, several consequences of great educational significance are characteristic: (1) the disadvantaged child is likely to be very poor; (2) the child is likely to react with fear, distrust, and hostility toward the institutions of a society which seem to give him little but pain; (3) he is likely by almost any literate standard to have an impoverished vocabulary and hence a meager capacity to understand abstract concepts. He tends to be limited to the vocabulary of his immediate environment; in addition he may enter the first grade without ever having seen a person read and with no knowledge of what the reading experience means. Psychologists have learned that these children will develop behavior patterns during the pre-school age that are impossible for the school to change. For all these reasons there is likely to be a deep rift, sensed or explicit, between the home and the school. As a result there is little preparation in the home for the child's school experience, little contribution to the child's understanding of what it is or what it can do for him, and little day to day reinforcement through the home of the progress which the school attempts to achieve. Just as these consequences of the culturally disadvantaged are grave handicaps to their bearers, so they are grave handicaps to the schools. Consequently, one of the great problems encountered in the education of the disadvantaged is that of the environment from which the child comes and in which he has to live. The economic and social condition of the home and the community from which the child comes transfer many unique problems into the school.

One of the striking things reflected in the literature with respect to the culturally disadvantaged is that as the individuals move through the public school system their problems become more and more difficult to deal with and ultimately they are lost to the public school systems and formal education. John A. Morsell, an associate director for the National Association of Advancement of Colored People, in dealing with this problem at the National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged made the following comment:

> More work is needed to clarify knowledge of the interaction between a child's state when entering school, what happens to him between his school years, and the nature of his non-school environment. For example, I have known that the gap in achievement of disadvantaged and advantaged children is substantial at first grade, and widens over the next several years. It is assumed that this represents a challenge to the school which is responsible for overcoming it. My personal inclination is to accept this view, but I and those who share this view would be on firmer grounds if research could determine to what extent the widening of the gap represents school inadequacies and to what extent it represents the continuing and the cumulative effect for the elements which produced the initial disparity.

Some schools in which disadvantaged children predominate are high in accomplishment and morale but too often the public school, America's chief instrument for fostering equality of opportunity, succeeds only in reinforcing the results of the discrimination that is built into the entire social fabric. When this happens, disadvantaged children learn to think that they are indeed untalented, unliked, and unworthy. They may react in the unhealthy ways characteristic of human beings who are repeatedly subjected to indignities. They may become over aggressive or pitifully withdrawn, learn little, and eventually drop out. They then have good reason to expect a future as bleak as their past. If the school cannot succeed with these children, they continue to live without the opportunities or satisfactions that most Americans enjoy. Eventually they tend to raise children in their own image. Their failing and society's injustice tend to be perpetuated into the next generation.

A myriad of reasons account for the inability of schools to solve these problems. By no means can all of these failures be laid at the doorstep of the school. First, the school is asked to remedy a profound failure in American life with deep roots in American history. Second, the public has rarely granted the schools anything near the resources they need to do the vast job; and third, the school is only one factor in the background of a citizen. In fairness to the schools, it should also be said that in spite of their problems and difficulties the public schools have been the means of many culturally disadvantaged children moving from the culturally disadvantaged segment of our society and achieving for themselves a position of affluence and effective citizenship.

Assuming that the Educational Policies Commission's objectives for education are adequate for all children and recognizing that educating the disadvantaged presents the schools with a set of problems not encountered in educating the advantaged, the issue reduces itself to one of identifying specific problems the education of the disadvantaged create for the schools.

The implication of this position for the public school is tremendous. It means curricular changes, new methodology, changes in organizational structure for implementing the kind of curriculum needed, changed facilities, and radical changes in administration policies and procedures as well as changes is how we educate teachers. In discussing this problem, Dr. Edward Zigler, professor of psychology at Yale University, states that a major issue in the education of the disadvantaged is whether the educators of the deprived should take a social work approach or should expand their energies and resources in beefing up those practices that are basic to the orthodox educational effort. In his opinion the dichotomy raised is a false one and stems from a failure to understand all the factors that are important in the determination of children's learning. Until teachers and administrators become fully cognizant of the complex nature of the learning process in the culturally deprived child, many of the innovations that hold high promise will be met with apathy if not actual hostility. Each culturally disadvantaged child brings to the classroom a motivational structure that is probably just as important in determining the success of the teacher's efforts as are the formal cognitive characteristics of the child.

Whatever we do in the way of providing education for the culturally disadvantaged, three criteria seem to be essential: (1) The curriculum materials used in the teaching process must be meaningful to the individuals. (2) The individuals must be able to meet with success in working with the materials. (3) The school experience must be a satisfying one.

The effort to effectively educate the disadvantaged under the ideal of equal education brings into focus once again attention and concern for the individual child as a person important in his own right. The true dignity and worth of each individual must be emphasized. This means that the school and the teacher must develop a program for each individual based on his or her particular needs, and no two children are exactly the same with respect to their needs. How can this be done? We do not know, but it is the great challenge in American education today. The ideal approach would be one of the teachers diagnosing each child's needs as an individual just as a physician does with his clients with respect to their illness. Once the child's needs are determined, a program of education would need to be developed to suit the particular needs of the individual.

In summary I would say what we need is not a set of educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged but an all out effort to learn what kind of changes need to be made in the organization and administration of schools, their curricular offerings, the methodology of teaching, facilities, and in the preparation of teachers to produce an educational program that will afford each individual the kind of opportunity for education to which he is entitled. Our specific objective is to identify the appropriate changes in the educational process, not to establish educational objectives for the culturally disadvantaged.

Chapter Three

SELF CONCEPT AS AN OBJECTIVE SELF-CONCEPT

by

ARTHUR COMBS

I have been asked to talk about the question of the self-concept, and, of course, this is a topic which is close to my heart. I don't suppose that there is any more exciting an idea in modern psychological thought than the things we are finding out about the importance of the self-concept. What I would like to do this evening is to make a quick review of what we know about the self-concept, and then I'd like to talk about what these ideas mean to me and what it seems they mean for those of us who are in the business of trying to produce changes in the world in which we are living.

What is the self-concept? What we mean by the self-concept is a system of beliefs, the beliefs which a person holds about himself. All of us have thousands of ways in which we see ourselves, and all of these taken together is what we refer to as the self-concept. The self-concept is something which is learned, and these beliefs about self develop a high degree of stability over a period of time. A person learns who he is and what he is. In this respect the self-concept is a *product* of one's experiences. But the self-concept is more important than that, because once it is learned, it then begins to determine future experience. In this sense it also becomes a process, so the self-concept is both product and process.

The reason why it is of such significance to us in education is because of our understanding of how tremendously important it is in determining behavior. Looking at behavior in perceptual terms, we understand that a person's behavior is always a result of two things: one, how he sees the situation in which he is involved, and two, how he sees himself. For example, at this moment I see myself as a lecturer and I am behaving accordingly, while you see yourself as an audience and you are behaving like an audience. Each of us is behaving in terms of how he sees himself at this time. Just so we are beginning to understand that the self-concept affects everything that one does and once it has become established it affects what one sees and hears. For example, people who see themselves as men behave like men and people who see themselves as women behave like women while people who are mixed up about it behave in a mixed-up fashion. For each of us, once established, the self-concept determines even what we see and what we hear. It has a selective effect on everything that we do.

The Self-Concept and Behavior

This fact is tremendously important for us, especially in the busines of education. Perhaps the most important single cause of a person's success or failure educationally has to do with the question of what he believes about himself. Take the case of reading. Almost never does a child come to the reading clinic these days who has anything wrong with his eyes. We catch that pretty early and routinely. The child who comes to the reading clinic is usually the child who *believes* he can't read. Because he believes he can't read, he doesn't try. Because he doesn't try, he doesn't get any practice. Because he doesn't get any practice, he doesn't do it very well. Then, when he doesn't do it very well, his teacher says, "My goodness, Jimmy, you don't read very well!" And that just proves what he already thought in the first place! Then, of course, we add to this a failing grade which we send home to his parents so they can tell him also. So the child finds himself surrounded by a kind of a conspiracy in which his beliefs are continuously corroborated in the kinds of experiences he has.

We now know that this business of how a person sees himself is basic to success, not only in reading, but in every other school subject whether we are talking about spelling or arithmetic or whether we are talking about algebra or geometry or foreign language or whatever you wish. In our own research at the University of Florida we found that a child's self-concept is even a better predictor of his success in reading than his intelligence test scores.

Self-Concept and Learning

Now, there is a second fact about the self-concept that is of tremendous importance. We know that the self-concept is intimately related to learning. In any learning situation, there are always two aspects. On the one hand, we have to acquire some new information, and on the other hand, we have to discover the meaning of the information we have acquired. Now, we have generally been very successful in the first part of that equation, in helping people to get new information. We're all experts at that. Where we have not been so successful in education is in helping people to discover the meaning of the information which we have provided them. Most of us don't misbehave because we don't know any better. We know how to drive, but we don't drive that way.

We know what we ought to eat, but we don't eat that. When we misbehave it is almost never because we don't know what we ought to do. The problem is one of not having grasped the meaning of that which we already know. This meaning is a question of the perceived relationship to self. Meaning refers to the degree to which a person has perceived the personal meaning of something for him, that is, its relationship to the self-concept. So the basic principle of learning goes something like this: *any information will affect a person's behavior only in the degree to which he has discovered the personal meaning of that information for him.*

Let me give you an illustration. I read in this morning's paper that there has been an increase in the number of cases of pulmonic stenosis in the State of Florida in the last ten years. That is interesting, but it just drifts through my conscious. It goes in one ear and out the other, as we say, because I don't know what pulmonic stenosis means. Well, a little later in the day a friend of mine mentions pulmonic stenosis in a conversation. This, when mentioned by a friend of mine, has more meaning to me because it is closer to myself. I don't want to admit that I don't know what it is so I go and look it up in the dictionary and I find out that pulmonic stenosis has to do with a condition of the closing up of the pulmonary artery, a condition that sometimes causes blue babies. Now it is something that I know. Well, later in the day, let's suppose that I get a letter from the parents of one of my students and Mrs. Brown tells me:

> Dear Sir: I would like you to know that we have taken Ellen to the hospital recently and had her examined. We find that she has pulmonic stenosis and is going to have to have an operation two years from now. We would appreciate it if you would take this into consideration, etc.

Well now, this same piece of information, which at first had no meaning for me and secondly only a slight meaning to me, now has much more meaning because it is happening to one of *my* students. So, it affects my behavior more. I talk to the other teachers. I say, "Did you hear what's happened to Ellen Brown? It's terrible. That poor child. She's got this terrible condition. She's going to have to have an operation on her heart, etc. . . ." I do all kinds of things. Let's go one step further. Let's suppose that I find out that my own daughter has pulmonic stenosis. That would affect my behavior tremendously! This illustrates what I mean by the basic principle of learning — that any information will affect a person's behavior only in the degree to which he has perceived the personal meaning of this information to his self.

So the self-concept becomes more important than ever. It is associated with the basic principle of learning. Incidentally, it is also the source of most of our failures in teaching. We have been very expert at giving people information but not so skillful at helping them to discover the personal meaning of information. Indeed, sometimes we even get in their way. For example, we say to a child, "That's very interesting, Jimmy, but I'm not interested in what you think about that, son. What does the book say?" Or we say, "Yes, indeed, Helen, but I'm not interested in what you feel about this. Now what did Johns and Smith find in that article they wrote in 1927?" This is a way of saying to the students that school is a place in which you learn about things that don't matter! This is the heart of the problem of the dropout. The dropout is not a dropout because we didn't give him information. We gave it. The problem is he never discovered the *meaning* of the information, so after a while he came to the conclusion that school is a place where you learn about things without much meaning. So, he dropped out. We could discuss this much further, but let us stop here with the principle that the very essence of learning is associated with the self-concept.

Self-Concept and Adjustment

The third thing about the self-concept we know is that the self-concept is deeply involved in the question of human adjustment. We know, for example, that well-adjusted people are those who see themselves in positive ways. They see themselves as people who are liked, wanted, acceptable, able, dignified, worthy — these kinds of things, while the maladjusted are the ones who see themselves as unwanted, unacceptable, unable, undignified, unworthy, etc. Think about it a moment and you will see that the people you have trouble with are not the ones who see themselves in positive ways. They are the ones who see themselves in essentially negative fashion. They are also the people who are unable to accept themselves. They are unable to accept who they are. They don't want to be who they are. They would like to be somebody else. Most of the cases we have in psychotherapy turn out to be people who cannot accept the truth about themselves. This is true whether we are talking about the middle-aged rover boy who is unable to accept the fact that he is growing older or the woman who feels that she is not a very good mother. We know today that the question of human adjustment is very largely a problem of the positive or negative view which a person has of himself.

Self-Concept and Intelligence

The self-concept is important, we are finding, for still a fourth reason. That is, it is deeply related to human intelligence itself. I suppose most of you here in this room were brought up with a belief about human intelligence — that intelligence is something fixed and immutable, something you get by inheritance. But we have begun to understand in recent years that this is not true. We now know that human intelligence is capable of very considerable change, that it is not merely a question of one's heredity. It has to do with the richness and extent of experience. And I might say to you that this is perhaps the most exciting idea for American education in our generation. It means that we are not the victims of the students we are working with. Indeed, we are the *creators* of intelligence!

What is the relationship of the self-concept to this? Well, a person's intelligence is a question of the effectiveness and the efficiency of his behavior. What we mean by a person's "behaving intelligently" is that he is behaving effectively and efficiently. Whether or not he can behave effectively and efficiently is largely affected by the self-concepts which he holds. For example, there are millions of people in our society who believe that they can only do *X* much. Believing they can only do *X* much, that is all they do. When the rest of us see them doing only *X* much, we say, "Well, that's an *X*-much person." That just proves what they always thought in the first place! So, we have millions of people walking around in this world who are the victims of their own self-perceptions. And I'm not just talking about other people. I'm talking about you, too. For example, almost certainly in an audience this size, at least 50 percent of you are thoroughly convinced you can't do math. Because you think you can't, you don't. Because you don't, you don't get any practice. Because you don't get any practice, you don't do it very well. Then, when you make out your income tax you make all kinds of mistakes and that just proves what you already thought in the first place! This vicious circle, with respect to the self-concept, is a determining factor in the degree to which a person behaves effectively and efficiently, and that is what we mean by intelligence. We now understand that this factor of the self-concept is also a most important factor in the problems of the culturally deprived. These are people who grow up believing that they are unable, unliked, unwanted, unacceptable, undignified, unworthy, or, you name it. It is also a basic problem of the Negro in the South who has been thoroughly brainwashed for generations that he isn't much good. So sometimes he behaves as though he wasn't, and the rest of us see that and say, "Well, what can you expect?"

So, we have found th1at the self-concept has its effect upon intelligence. If any of you are interested in pursuing this question further I would like to suggest a book, *Intelligence and Experience* by James McV. Hunt, which reviews all the evidence on this matter and concludes that intelligence, indeed, can be created.

We have been living for generations almost exclusively preoccupied with human limitations instead of human possibilities. We have sold ourselves a bill of goods. We have been so preoccupied with human limitations that we have failed to understand the vastness of human potential. The outstanding factor about the human being is not his limitations but his possibilities. The human organism is overbuilt. It is built like an engineer builds a bridge. When he builds a bridge, he builds into it a safety factor of 15 or 20 times what it will ever have to sustain. So it is with human beings. All of us, everyone of us, never live up to anything but a very small proportion of what is possible. So, we are understanding today that human intelligence can be created, that it is a function of the richness and the extent and the availability of perceptions. This, of course, is determined in very large part by the self-concept. How you perceive yourself determines what you think you are able to do and that determines in turn what you will try. So the self-concept has a tremendous effect upon the intelligence of the individual.

Self-Concept and the Professional Worker

A fifth thing we know about self-concept in recent years is that it plays an important role is professional competence. At the University of Florida we have been doing experiments on the helping professions. We have now completed researches on good and poor teachers, good and poor counselors, good and poor Episcopal priests, and are now in the process of work on good and poor nurses. What we find in these studies is that the crucial characteristic of these people has to do with how they see themselves. The good counselors, good teachers, good priests are people who see themselves in positive ways. The poor ones see themselves in negative ways. So we find that the self-concept has and effect on one's professional competence as well as upon general behavior, intelligence, adjustment, and learning.

We could discuss any of these points at much greater length, but let us now take a look at what self-concept means for us in action. For those of us who are in the business of helping people grow, the important thing about the self-concept is that the concept is not something which you are born with, it is something which you learn. It is learned as a consequence of our experience with the significant people in our lives. And because it is learned, it can be taught. That means for all of us a great new hope, and at the same time, a great new responsibility. It represents a great new hope in dealing with people. It says to us that maybe the Great Society is not a dream after all. Maybe it could really be achieved. Maybe human deprivation and human poverty can really be overcome. Maybe it is possible and that, of course, is a great hope for all of us. It means that we are not the victims of the child's intelligence; we are the creators of it. That is a very exciting idea, because, for too many generations, we have believed that there wasn't anything you could do about it. We no longer need think that. Think, for example, what this view means for the problem of the gifted. If it is true that intelligence can be created, then the gifted child is not something to be found and specially nourished. The gifted child is our crowning achievement. He is the child with whom we have already been immensely successful. The problem is not to find them and give them special nourishment, but to find out how we did it and to get about the business of doing it more often! That is a quite different question and a most exciting one for the whole field of education.

If it is true that a person's self-concept is learned, it means also that what you and I do is immensely important. If it is true that people learn who they are and what they are from the significant people in their lives, then you and I are not living in vain. What we do is immensely important. You know, sometimes we haven't believed that. The college has said, "What can you do when they come to you like that from high school?" And the high school says, "What can you do when they come to you like that from the grade school?", and the grade school says, "What con you do when you get them from that kind of a home?" Everybody's been passing the buck to everybody else. If the self-concept is learned, however, then there is something which everyone can do to help others and what we do is not in vain unless we make it so. That's a great hope. It is also a great responsibility, because if it is true that the self-concept is learned, then what people become is what they have been made. As Earl Kelley says in his delightful little book, *In Defense of Youth,* which I recommend to you, is, "Whenever we get worried about the younger generation, we need to remind ourselves they were all right when we got them!" The self-concept, what a person believes about himself, is learned, as Harry S. Sullivan says, "From the mirror that is held up to him by the people that surround him." He learns who he is and what he is from how he is treated by the people who surround him. The self-concept is acquired from the significant people in a person's life. This means that you and I have a terrific responsibility. We have to stop passing the buck and get about the business of behaving in ways that are good for other people.

We used to think that the most important things about a human personality came from the traumas is his life, now, we are beginning to doubt that. We are beginning to understand that much more important are the little everyday things that happen to people, the things that chip away at their beliefs about themselves and teach them who they are and what they are. We used to think it was the big things, like the time granddaddy died, or the time the house burned down, or the time baby brother was born, some tragedy like that in the life of a child. We no longer believe that. We now understand that a person's self-concept is built by *everything* that happens to him, especially the many, many little things that happen over his lifetime that he may not even be able to remember in years to come.

What does all this mean then for you and me beyond the fact of a great hope and a great responsibility? Well, I'd like to suggest some things it means to me.

The Need for Developing Sensitivity

First, it means that all of us who are working with people need to develop a great sensitivity to how things are with the other fellow. Incidentally, one of the things we have found that makes a clear distinction between good professional workers and poor ones is precisely that. The good ones have a high degree of sensitivity to how things are with the people they are working with and the poor ones do not. If we are going to be concerned about people's self-concepts, one of the things we have to do is to become more sensitive to what's happening in their world and to what their self-concepts are like. For example, just recently I sat in on a conversation with a supervisor who was talking with a teacher about a little boy. The teacher said, "I tell him — I say, 'Jimmy, you can do it son. It's easy.' But he won't even try!" The supervisor said to this teacher, "Honey, don't *ever* tell a child something is easy." Well, that surprised me, so I said to this supervisor, "What do you mean by that?" She said, "Well, look at it from the child's point of view. If you tell him it's easy and he *can't* do it, the only conclusion he can come to is he must be stupid! If you tell him it is easy and he *can* do it, look what you've done. You've taken all the glory out of it! There's no glory in doing something that is easy." Then she turned to this teacher and said, "Honey, tell him it's hard, but tell him also that you are pretty sure he can do it. Then, if he can't do it, he hasn't lost face and if he *can* do it, what a glory that is for him!" This is what I mean by sensitivity to how things look in the world of the people we are dealing with. It is a failure to have this kind of sensitivity which is responsible for more breakdowns in human communication than any other one thing. It is especially important for you and me who are working with people from social groups other than our own because it is very easy to make the assumption that how it is to them is the way it is to us. Phyllis McGinley has a little couplet about this that goes like this:

> *My friend, I think we must give up the fiction, That we can argue any view. For what in me is pure conviction, Is simply prejudice in you.*

I think of an example of this I knew some years ago. A social worker up North in the middle of the winter came across a family without coal. She was greatly touched by this family's situation and she thought — "This is terrible. This family hasn't any coal. They are having a hard time." So, she went back to her office and wrote an order for a ton of coal. When the ton of coal was delivered to the house that afternoon, the delivery man went up to the door and the husband in the family came to the door. The delivery man told them that he had brought a ton of coal from the social welfare department — "Please sign for it." The father of the family signed for the coal and left town. With the best of intentions, the social worker thought she was doing a good thing for this family. But for this father, the delivery of this ton of coal was the last desperate demonstration that he was "not a man", that he could not support his own family. He couldn't take that thought so he left and he has never been heard of since. The development of sensitivity is essential if we are going to use our knowledge of the self-concept.

People Bring Their Self-Concepts With Them

The second thing all this means to me is, if the self-concept is as important as I've been talking about, then we have to recognize that the persons we are working with bring their self-concepts with them wherever they go. The teacher has to recognize that the child brings his self-concept right inside the class. He doesn't park it at the door. He brings it right in with him. What we do has its effect on the self-concept whether we know it or not. Everything we do may have effect upon a person's self-concept — because he learns it from his experiences in the world. We have seen some fascinating experiments in this connection in recent years. Down in New Zealand, a chap by the name of Staires did an experiment with two matched classes of children in fourth grade. One of these classes was taught by a teacher who was interested in the question of the self-concept, the other was taught by a teacher who wasn't interested in it, didn't know anything about it. At the end of the year, the children in the class with the teacher who was interested in the self-concept (but so far as anybody knows, he didn't do anything specific about it. He was just interested in it) had adjustment scores which rose considerably while the children in the class with the teacher who didn't know about the self-concept went down. Apparently, if you are aware, you automatically find ways of dealing with the problem. Perhaps, an even more interesting experiment was one done very recently by Rosenthal. Rosenthal gave intelligence tests to all the children going to school in a certain school system. These intelligence test scores he filed away, then took the names of children at random and told the teacher that 20 percent of these children were due to make remarkable gains in intelligence in the coming year. Sure enough, they did despite the fact that they were picked at random without reference to their intelligence test scores. Their intelligence increased because the teachers *thought* it would. The fact that the teachers believed and were sensitive to this fact made a difference in their behavior even though nobody knows precisely what it was they did. Presumably having a more hopeful attitude for children produced better results.

The Need to Humanize Schools

The principle we are discussing, also means to me that our schools must be humanized. I would like to point out to you that we are at the present time in grave danger in this respect. Practically all of the efforts going into changing our public schools today are pushing us in the other direction. With all the terrible pressure we have to change American education today we are stressing the giving of information almost exclusively. Practically all the research that is going on, all of the innovations we are advocating are to develop new ways to give people more information, more quickly, more efficiently, more effectively than ever before. As though we needed more information! We are drowning in information. Most of us have more information now than we know what to do with. We're like the old farmer who, when they asked him why he wasn't using the new methods, said, "Hell, I ain't farming now half as well as I know how!"

Many of the present pressures on American education have the effect of increasingly dehumanizing the process. The terrible pressures we are under are creating an alienated generation, people who feel out-of-touch uncommitted, uninvolved. I don't think it is any accident that young people are walking around in Berkeley with signs that say, "Don't fold, spindle, or mutilate me." It isn't any accident that the best advice they give each other is "Play it Cool," "Don't get involved." There is a terrible process of dehumanization going on. When some of us raise our voices in protest people often say, "Well, what do you want? Do you want to have education for intellect or emotion?" As though you could separate these, as though we had to choose to educate for smart psychotics or well-adjusted dopes! Obviously, we are not seeking either of these extremes. We have to have human people who know, but it is not enough simply to know. We have decided we must have a rich curriculum but to have rich curriculum, we have to have large schools. But people get lost in large schools. So then we have to have a guidance department to find them again!

In some of our schools the dehumanization brought about by the terrible emphasis upon information has produced a feeling on the part of the young people that there isn't anybody they can talk to, there isn't anything human left in the schools. We cannot suspend the laws of learning. If it is true that the self-concept is as important as I've been saying it is, then you and I cannot ignore it because it affects people whether we know it or not. The laws of learning cannot be suspended because they are inconvenient. Some years ago I went to talk to a College of Agriculture. I was discussing some of the things that affect learning and when I got through one professor of agronomy got up and said, "Well, Professor, this is very interesting, all these things you are talking about that have to do with learning, but I don't have time to pay attention to that. I have to teach people about agronomy." So, I said to him, "You know, Professor, I respect your field of agronomy and I would like for you to respect my field of psychology. You have discovered by a great deal of research in your field that certain things are required to make plants grow, like you have to have the right kind of soil conditions, the right kind of drainage, the right kind of organic organisms and the right kind of ph in the soil, the right kind of friability, etc. Now, with all this, you wouldn't go to a farmer and say, "Look, Bud, we have all this information about how to grow things but don't bother with it. Just throw the seed on the ground." Well, you can't disregard the laws of learning either. To say I am going to teach without reference to the self-concept is like saying, "I know my car needs a carburetor, but I'm going to drive mine without one!"

The Fallacy of Failure

A third thing all this means to me is that the basic push for all of us must somehow be to help people to create a positive view of themselves in place of the negative ones which many of them now hold, because we know that a positive view of self is related to intelligence, is related to human adjustment, is related to human happiness, is related to self-actualization, is related to the success of a person in our society. Unfortunately, there are many people in our society today who have grown up with an idea that failure is good for people. They really believe that failure is good for people and that the world is a hard, tough place so, "people ought to learn to fail early!" I'm serious! There are people who believe that. What we know about failure is that the best guarantee that a person will be able to deal successfully with the future is that he has been successful in the past. The best guarantee that a person will be able to deal with difficulties in the future is that he has been successful in dealing with them in the past. We now understand that positive feelings about one's self give persons a great internal security that makes it possible for them to deal more effectively with life. Like a ship, if you've got a tight ship, one that you can be sure of, you can go sailing far from shore. But if you're not sure of your ship, you have to stay close to harbor. You have to play it very cautiously, operate very tentatively, and as a consequence, you are more likely to fail. Failure, psychologically, is like disease, physiologically. Physiologically, a disease is a failure of the physical organism. Now, we don't say about physical failure, "Let us give this child all the diseases we can as soon as possible." Rather we say, "Let us keep this child from getting these diseases just as long as we possibly can." Or alternatively, what we say is, "Let us give him the disease, but let us give it to him in such an attenuated form that we know he will be successful with it." That is what we do with an inoculation or vaccination or an immunization. Because he has been successful with the weakened form, he is strengthened to deal with the real thing when it comes along. So it is *with psychological* failure.

Abe Maslow once described human maladjustment in poetic terms. He says, "Human maladjustmest is the screaming of the victim at the crushing of his psychological bones." That is precisely what it is. Human maladjustment is a problem in human failure and failure is not good for people. It is debilitating, destructive and destroying. Even the self-made man who beats his chest and says, "Look at me, what a fine fellow I am," is a walking demonstration of what I am talking about. He got to be a self-made man precisely because he didn't fail. If he had failed, he wouldn't be a self-made man! Now, where we got the idea that failure is so good for people, I'm sure I don't know. There are a tremendous number of experiences we condemn people to which teach them the business of failure very, very early. It fascinates me that we don't even have a word in our language to describe the situation where a person set out to do something and didn't do it, except the word *failure*. We have no word which describes that a person set out to do something and didn't make it other than the word "failure", and the word "failure" always carries with it the feeling that you're a "no-goodnik", that you're somehow a "slob". We are obsessed with failure and we teach people to fail very early.

The Need for Success Experience

For example, in a kindergarten there are two youngsters building houses with blocks and you say to this little boy, "Say, that's a nice house you're building there." He is pleased and says about the little boy next to him, "Joe is building a house, too. He's a better builder than me.", and he is delighted for Joe. But not for long! Pretty soon someone comes along and says, "Now what's the matter with you? How come you don't build as good a house as Joe? What kind of a slob are you?" Very quickly, and very early, we build into people the feeling that it is a disaster to do anything less than the very best, and we do it with the best of intentions. We want them to become better, and in the process of urging them on, we are actually teaching them a negative thing. Earl Kelley has a saying about this. He says, "Whatever causes a person to feel that his self is diminished is also stultifying and stupefying." That, we now know, is true. Failure experience destroys human personality, human intelligence, human capacity, and human happiness. A positive view of self is only learned from success experiences. In a sense, that tells us what you and I have to do. If it is true that the well adjusted, the intelligent, the self-fulfilled, the reliable, and people with self-concepts which are positive, then the answers to what you and I have to do in working with cultural deprivation or in education are to be found in these questions: (1) How can a person feel wanted unless somebody wants him? (2) How can a person feel acceptable unless somewhere he is accepted? (3) How can a person feel that he is a person of dignity and integrity unless somebody treats him so? (4) How can a person feel that he is able unless somewhere he has some success? In the answers that you and I find to these questions, we will find the answers to what we need to do with the Indians, or the Negroes, or the poverty stricken whites, or even our own children or fellow workers.

If we are going to work with the self-concept, whatever experiences we provide for people in trying to help them develop better self-concepts must be real life because the self-concept learned from real experience, not from just telling people. As the old Indian said, "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." People read what we do in spite of what we say. A good example of that is what happens so frequently in the South. You know, there are quite a few white people who think they understand Negroes. They will proclaim loudly and longly that they really understand them because "they lived with them all these years," but that ain't so. For generations it has been necessary, absolutely necessary, as a matter of survival for Negroes to be sensitive to whites, but the whites haven't had to be sensitive to Negroes.

The Need for Authenticity

The concepts we have been talking about also mean to me that the kinds of experiences we provide must be more than just words. You have to give a person an experience of being valuable. You can't just say to him, "You're a great guy." He has to have an experience which helps him to feel so. The words are not enough. Sometimes teachers have assumed that a child's self-concept needed to be boosted so they would tell a child who was unable to read, "You're reading very nicely Jimmy." Well, the difficulty with that is, it's a lie and it's immoral to tell children lies. What we have to do is to find ways of helping Jimmy to *feel* that he is a good reader and it's also the truth. That's why in the reading clinic, the child who is reading at the third grade level and who is in the sixth grade is taken back to the third grade level where he can be successful. Then we can say, "That's good, you read that very well."

Unfortunately, many children are condemned to failure. Take the child who's reading at the third grade level in the sixth grade. This child has a failure experience day after day after day after day after day, hour after hour after hour. Every day of his life, he fails, and why? Because you and I can't adjust to teaching a child who's reading at the third grade level in the sixth grade! We are hung up by an inflexible kind of organization which condemns this child to experience failure because *we* can't make the adjustment. We do the same thing throughout our society. We could get rid of the slums, for example. We could do it and we could afford it. Not long ago I was at Cape Kennedy. While there, I watched a rocket go sailing off into space and the man from NASA said, "There goes three hundred and twenty-nine million dollars!" Or, I would remind you that the war in Vietnam is costing us forty-three billion dollars a year. I am told that 85 cents out of every dollar in our federal budget goes to pay for past, or present wars. We could eliminate the sources of failure for our people if we had the will to do so. Unfortunately, we have created incredible barriers — incredible barriers to people developing positive views of themselves. We have condemned people to failure in many places in our society.

Removing Barriers to Learning

With the best intentions we have sometimes created feelings of failure. In schools, we have emphasized the business of the necessity for making good grades so much, that we have made it a matter of survival to get grades. So then, we are trapped. When people cheat because we have made the ante so high they had no other alternative, then, we back off and make it a nice, moral issue. We create experiences of failure because we are so preoccupied with external values. Not long ago, I was in a museum and there was a group of children there looking at a painting. The teacher was standing there very jittery while the kids were standing there, utterly goggle-eyed taking in this great big painting hung up on the wall. The teacher couldn't stand it. She said, "If you kids don't hurry up, you aren't going to see anything!"

If we're really going to pay attention to the importance of the self-concept, one of the things we need to do is to systematically examine our practices and remove the barriers that get in the way of the development of people's positive views of self. If any of you are in the field of education, you know what those barriers are. We've been talking about them for years. We all know them. Our exclusive preoccupation with facts instead of meanings, the idea we've had that intelligence is fixed and immutable, our terrible preoccupation with grades and evaluation, the terrible pressure we have for conformity, instead of creativity, our overwhelming preoccupation with order and neatness and quietness and goodness, the terrible need we have for everything to be based on authority, solitary learning cookbook approaches, lockstep progressions, competition! These are things which we have developed which have the effect on many people of condemning them to failure experiences or giving them the feeling that school is a place where you learn about things that don't matter.

Self-Concept and Commitment and Responsibility

Several years ago I had an assignment to make a speech on commitment and I went to a college of sophomore students in education and said to them, "How come young people today don't get committed and involved? How come in other countries sometimes when the students riot, they sometimes change the government?" So they told me. These are some of the things they said. "Students and teachers are enemies of each other and they ought to be friends. They feed us a pablum diet. It's all chewed over and all the flavor's gone out of it. Nobody ever believes what we have to say is important. Nobody wants to listen to us. Nobody cares about us. It's details, details, details, that's all that matters. Everybody wants us to conform. It's just grades, grades, grades, grades, as though they mattered." But this whole class, one hundred percent agreed on this statement. "The things worth getting committed to don't get you ahead!" I think that's a terrible indictment. It means we have not permitted the self of the student to enter into the process of education with us. We have almost ruled his "self" out of education. If we are really going to deal with the self-concept, we are going to have to give people a great deal more opportunity for self-direction and responsibility. And I would like to point out to you that responsibility is something which is learned like every other subject — by success experience with little ones before the big ones and you can never learn to be responsible by having it withheld.

Let me give you an illustration. Here's a teacher who says to her kids, "you see I've got to go down to the office for a few minutes. I want you to be good kids 'til I get back." So she goes down to the office, and when she gets back the room is in bedlam. She sails into the middle of this group and she says, "I will never leave you alone again." And by this act she has robbed these children of their only opportunity to learn how to behave when the teacher isn't there. You can't learn how to behave when the teacher isn't there if the teacher never leaves you! We do the same thing with student government on the high school level. We say, "Now you can govern yourselves." So they make a law, and we say, "Uhuh, not that." So, they make another law and we say, "Nope, not that either!" So they get the message. They recognize that the student government is only a game; so, they treat it as though it was only a game. And that makes us really mad. We say, "For heaven's sake! Look at that; they don't even treat their own student government as though it's serious." We forget that it was we who taught them that because we were afraid to let them try.

Self-Concept and Self-Direction

Not long ago I was in a school which had just had an election and the teachers were in a tizzy because the character who got elected as class president was elected on a platform in which he promised the students everything under the sun. He promised that they would have every Friday afternoon off, there would be no more failures in examinations, that the detention room would be eliminated. He promised them special passes to the football games and on and on and on. And he got elected! The teachers were in a stew. They thought this was very immoral and they ought to reverse the election. They asked me what I thought and I said, "I think that's great! Let them live with it. Let them find out what a terrible thing it is to elect a dope to office!" What happens is that we are oftentimes fearful of letting people take the consequences of their own behavior. Because we are afraid they might make a mistake, we rob them of the very opportunities to learn which many of them need.

If the things we know about self-concept are to be put to work, you and I are going to have to give people a great deal more opportunities for self-direction. That means for those of us who are working with the culturally deprived, for example, that we're going to have to be a lot more willing than we have been to let them grow in the directions of significance to them. I was out in Hawaii this summer and heard about an interesting example. They have a problem in Hawaii of teaching youngsters who speak pigeon English at home to speak good English in school. (The students called good English "teacher talk".) For a long time they got nowhere telling these kids, "You shouldn't talk pigeon English. You should speak good English." They got nowhere until somebody got the bright idea, "Let's teach them to speak good pigeon." When they started to teach them to speak good pigeon, they began to speak good English also! They spoke pigeon at home and they spoke "teacher talk" in school and when they were taught to speak both of them students learned both more effectively. It is important to accept the place where the person is, because you can't go from where you're not. Frequently, what we do with people we work with is to demand that they be where we want them to get eventually. Take the case of the juvenile delinquent who for fiteen years has learned, "Nobody likes me; nobody wants me; nobody cares about me," and finally comes to the conclusion that, "Well, I don't like nobody neither!" So he comes slouching into the office, plops himself into a chair and slouches all over the place. He keeps his hat on and looks defiant. It is only too easy to say to him, "Now look here, you behave yourself. Sit up there young man and be polite!" Now being polite is the one thing he can't do. Being polite in his world would ruin him! What we're saying to him really is, "Young man when you get better I'll help you. Go away, get better, and come back, and then I'll help you." Because we are not willing to begin where he is, we demand that he be what we hope he'll be when we get through with him!

Self-Concept Changes as Basic Objectives

Ideas about the self-concept mean to me still another thing. One of the things we're going to have to do is to evaluate professional workers in terms of the degree to which they are helping people's self-concepts and pay off on it. We've been saying — these human qualities, these questions of human beings, their attitudes and beliefs — all these are important; they are the general objectives of education. But what we mean by "general objectives" is that they can be *generally ignored* by everybody. We evaluate people on the basis of their specialties. For example, we evaluate the first grade teacher on how well she teaches kids to read and we evaluate the English teacher on how well the child is learning to write a theme. We evaluate the science teacher on how many of his students won the National Talent Search, and we evaluate the coach on his win-loss record. Everybody is evaluated on his speciality, but nobody evaluates on how well we are helping people to grow. No one evaluates on how well we are helping people. No one evaluates on how well a teacher helps his students to grow. No one evaluates the ability of students to relate to each other and nobody is held responsible for teaching citizenship or responsibility or self-direction.

Suggest if the self-concept is as important as we are beginning to discover it is, then what we have to do is help the people who are working with these matters to see that it is important and to evaluate the effectiveness with which they do it. That means that you and I have to think it is important, too, because everybody behaves only in terms of what he thinks is important. The children do what the teacher thinks is important and the teacher does what the principal thinks is important. Unless *we* believe that it is important to pay attention to the self-concept it isn't going to be paid attention to. So, one of the things we have to do is evaluate people on their effectiveness in working with this and paying off on the people who do it better.

The Need for Much More Research

Finally, let me say one more thing about what this means to me. It means to me that we need a heavy commitment of time, money, and research to the whole question of the self-concept and its significance for the culturally disadvantaged. And this, I would like to point out, is not the direction in which we are currently moving. We are currently pouring billions and billions of dollars into research in education, most of which is going for hardware, for new ways of organization, or for new ways of collecting and disseminating information more effectively and more efficiently than ever. It happens that I am a reader for Title III. The projects I see are almost exclusively preoccupied with ways of giving people more information more effectively and more efficiently. Almost nobody seems to be working with the question of how do you help people to see themselves better? How do you help people to develop better human relationships? How do you help people to expand their intelligence? How do you deal with the problem of meaning?

A few years ago I wanted to establish a Research and Development Center, so I turned into the U. S. Office of Education a proposal to establish a center which would be devoted to the question of perception and its importance for education. It was turned down with the statement that "the concept is too narrow." Imagine! The concept is too narrow! I think somewhere along the way we have to recognize that these questions of self-perception are not narrow things but are, indeed, some of the most important basic questions that we face, and for which we need a whole field of research. I said earlier that we have discovered that intelligence is something which can be created. We have been the victims of our perceptions. Because we didn't believe it was possible, nobody tried it. Now that we believe that it is possible, we need to get about the business of finding out how to do it. I would like to suggest that there are thousands of good elementary teachers around these United States who have been doing it. One of the things we ought to do in research is to find out who they are and what they've been up to and then find ways of helping more people to learn how to do it. I think also, that we need to take a look at some of the fascinating new things going on in other sciences. For example, in modern humanistic psychology there are some fascinating possibilities for research in working with people and ways of helping to develop their self-concepts which we ought to explore and bring into the educational field. The same thing is true in existential philosophy and in social work and in anthropology and in psychotherapy. These are fascinating new ideas which have important implications for those of us who are in the business of education as well.

These are exciting times. They have much promise and I think we need to capitalize on some of these. Especially, I think we need to begin to turn more of our expenditures of money and effort toward the problem of the self-concept and its implications. "What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?" What shall it profit a child if he knows all about the world but is unable to handle it, or to deal with it effectively. Where does it get him? I think we need to recognize that such matter of the self-concept are not going to be solved by computers.

Twenty years ago in American education we had a great movement which was called "Action Research." It had to do with getting teachers to do research. But one of the unfortunate things that has happened in recent years is that we have developed a whole new bunch of people who are experts at research and the teachers have given up. They have turned over the research to these very special people who are experts in talking to computers, but don't know how to talk to teachers. We have a new group of experts at the sophisticated aspect of research and the teachers are now saying, "Oh, I couldn't do research. I couldn't do that." Teachers have abrogated research, they think they are not sufficiently skilled. I think this is a tragedy. In the final analysis, it is the teachers who are going to have to change. If we don't change the teachers there isn't going to be any change in American education. It isn't going to be changed by the researchers or the administrators unless somehow we get the teachers in the act. We must get them to try new things, but I'm afraid that in many cases we have made them frightened to try.

COMMENTARY ONE

by

J. E. PETERS

I regret in many ways having to react to Dr. Combs because there are so many things he says with which I must agree, and do agree with heartily, yet there are some fundamental things where I disagree with him. Perhaps in private conversation, we would not disagree.

Early in his talk, he mentioned that a reading problem is one where the child believes he can't read. I quickly acknowledge that this *is* an important factor, but I can't accept this as the only factor. There are many, many cases where, I think, the child has a real limitation in reading, and it isn't just the matter of his believing that he can't read. In disagreeing with Dr. Combs about this, I think there's a danger of falling into a dichotomy, as though there are such things as either natural limitations or unlimited potential. I don't think that either of us should be put in the position of having this kind of dichotomy because I certainly disagree with him about the inheritance. I think, also, intelligence can change, and I think that our interests, certainly in education should be on how much change can occur and what we can do to bring children beyond what they are at a given point. I agree with him in this very much, but I think we also have to be realistic about what a child can be expected to do. However, I don't feel that these are incompatible ideas, and I do feel that his interest is the correct one at this time. I don't see how we can talk about potentials without also being concerned with limitations. Though he will not agree with me on this, I think we can agree that if we talk about limitations in terms of evaluating what a child does now, that this is not a permanent prediction, then we can go from here to the next step, and the next step, and the next step. I suspect we can agree about this very easily.

I certainly agree about the importance of self-confidence. It's tremendously important. I don't doubt that research needs to be done in this area, but it's hard for me to see how it can be taught as an abstraction. It's an extremely difficult thing to separate from skills and from concrete experiences. As an example, one of the speakers talked about the "bug in the ear" method of instruction to a teacher, who was using an operant conditioning method of teaching the child. The teacher was being taught by an instructor also. While the teacher was properly rewarding the child when he made a little tiny success, the instructor was also rewarding the teacher when she made some success, giving her some guidance. This is a kind of a concrete way of dealing with success for the child and the teacher that is on the way toward a real and true concrete development of a good, healthy self-concept.

A first step toward improved self-concept must come from an evaluation of where the child is, regardless of whether we are going to theoretically say we can predict something about him in the future or whether we can't. We certainly have to know where he is now. We can't teach him skills unless we have this evaluation of his existing abilities and disabilities, his strength and deficits. Here is probably where we disagree. I do feel that each child has his own problems of profile, strengths and deficits, intellects, emotions, attention, motor control, and in addition, within intellect itself there is a profile of strengths and deficits that the school people must recognize to appreciate. To use a rather loose, crude analogy, even though large feet tend to be associated with large bodies, the exceptions are terribly important. They are important enough that we can't possibly fit shoes by knowing just sizes of bodies, or fit clothes by knowing sizes of shoes to fit feet. These things don't hinge together. They do as an abstraction or as a statistical trend. More people with large bodies will have large feet obviously, and vice versa. But the exceptions are terribly important. That we know the exact size of the feet to fit the shoe properly is important.

In the same way, an intelligent child may have a very small ability to spell or to read. The child of average ability in handling language and in personal concepts may be an asthmatic cripple. I am speaking of extremes because so much of my experience has to do with extremes. In our Child Guidance Clinic I see the more extreme cases. I see these in their very clear form, where a child of average intelligence, who is *not* maladjusted, who *has not* had bad home experiences, who reads, let's say when he is 11 years old at a first grade level, has severe handicaps in this area through no fault of his own. Granted, his failures are going to be very catastrophic for him. They are going to compound and make him have a very severe problem later on. But I feel that the one cannot be predicted from the other in dealing with individuals. There may well be this overall prediction that when a child has an average intelligence, the likelihood is that he will have an average ability or capacity in the sub-skills.

I feel it is very important that we have an evaluation of where the child is in order to go into the next step. Of course, education is a field that is highly developed in this area. There are all kinds of ways to do it. There need to be many more such as breaking down the finer aspects of examinations and perceptual skills as such. The group tests are certainly the first line of approach, and for those who do poorly, either on group tests or in school work, individual evaluation is essential.

The knowledge of a child's pattern of strengths and weaknesses at the time you have him gives a solid basis for teaching him skills that can lead to a better self-concept. To assume that they are all alike and without the knowledge to insure this, many will not fit. They certainly will suffer defeat and risk having a poorer self-concept. For me, this means a willingness on the part of education to deal with children individually much more than in groups. Practically, since it's impossible to have a teacher for each child, I think this must mean evaluating him so as to deal with him in much smaller groups. It might be fractious on my part to take this position, but I feel that if we did change the pupil-teacher ratio from the usual one-to-thirty, to one-to-fifteen, we would solve one trouble, naturally involving billions, more than any other thing we could do with developing skill. Just the possibility of bringing the good qualities of the teacher closer to the good qualities of the pupil will help. I deeply agree with Dr. Combs about how much better it would be to put our billions into education for the future and for our children to answer this.

I think this is a tremendous field and Dr. Combs covered many interesting aspects of the self-concept. As I mentioned, I found much of it very interesting, stimulating, and I agree with much of it. I would like to re-emphasize and re-phrase one area on which he touched. I like to think of the importance of a person achieving an expertise in at least one square foot of territory that he can stand on. I think this applies to children also. If they can just carve out one tiny little area where they can achieve some success, where they are perhaps a little better than the group around them in this individual thing, I think this concept of being able to draw a circle and to limit the goal, even though this isn't a permanently fixed limit, is a tremendously important concept for children and people together. I think our society as a whole needs to have self-concept very much.

COMMENTARY TWO

by

J. B. JONES

We accepted in the orientation session of last evening to decide what a reactor was actually supposed to do and then how much time he should take. We finally decided on approximately ten minutes and then it was agreed that we could count on half the time, so I suppose this is where I stand at the moment. I wouldn't be J. B. Jones from Texas unless I utilized part of my five minutes in a bit of fun. With regards to my appearance here, I am reminded of the football team engaged in a game they were predicted to win, but they were now in the fourth quarter and the score was zero-zero and they were making very little showing towards a touchdown and the winning of the game. The coach and the quarterback engaged in an argument as to which play should be called and finally in disgust and anger, the coach said to the quarterback, "Mess it up yourself." He went to the sideline and on the next play the quarterback came out of the huddle, called the signals, the team scored the touchdown and won the game. The coach, proud, yet concerned, went into the dressing room and asked the quarterback, "What happened?" "How did you manage to do it?" The quarterback said, "Oh, coach, it was simple. I came out of the huddle, I came up to the line, I looked at the right guard and saw a seven, I looked at the left guard and saw a six, and I put the two together, seven and six, and I called play fourteen." The coach said, "Well, look son, seven and six is thirteen, it's not fourteen." And he said, "You see there coach if I'd been as smart as you we'd have lost the game."

So you see if I was as smart as some I wouldn't be up here. That's why I'm here. Of particular concern, and let me recommend to all of you, with due credit to Dr. Beck for having brought it to my attention, *The Negro Self-Concept* as published by McGraw-Hill. The local conference conducted and the papers presented therein are here. You'll find it's particularly stimulating and will probably do in better fashion and more extended form that which I would comment with regards to Dr. Combs presentation. I should say that Dr. Combs and I have met previously at institutes and workshops at Texas Southern, so his philosophy is not new and I endorse it wholeheartedly.

I am glad that Dr. Combs brought to our attention individualized instruction that is based upon the self-concept, rather than just individualized instruction based upon ability level, because I think this is important. I do also say that the self-concept is one of the great concerns for those of us identified with the Negro group, particularly as we go into integration, because we are concerned about the image of the individual child. We have suffered along with somewhat of a dual kind of concept. The concept that we face in society and the concept that we have of ourselves are very often not at all harmonious. We have always been very greatly concerned about the kind of concept that the world gives our child.

I have a three and a half year old son. Last month we were in St. Louis and I have been concerned about how he would, in this pluralistic society, develop a concept of self to where his identification would center. While in St. Louis we went to a theatre in the Washington University vicinity to see Sidney Poitier in, "To Sir, With Love", and we sat in the theatre surrounded by Caucasians. In the midst of one of the very colorful scenes that Sidney Poitier appeared in under the name of Mark, my son broke the silence of the theatre and said, "Daddy, is Mark a soul brother?" I suddenly realized that somewhere along the line he had gotten the message. But I was dismayed the next day when I suddenly asked him, "Are you a soul brother?" And he said, "No, No." So I still have gotta learn what the criteria for a soul brother is.

I had written down beforehand an expectation in terms of Dr. Combs. The expectation being that he would deal with the concept in terms of a definition, the force of it, the components of criteria, and the techniques for modifying or strengthening it. I think that certainly he has dealt with and has added to, which I have not included, those influences and the importance of the self-concept, and for this I feel we ought to be grateful. I would not attempt to differ with points in large, but let me address myself to the fact that since we are engaged in the pluralistic society, and am probably geared in this direction, because I have been working with the de-segregation institutes in Texas, and I have been working as part of a team — one Caucasian, one Latin-American, and one Negro. I usually have been called upon to take the Negro point of view.

Let me say this with regards to the concepts. I think that one thing we ought to be concerned with in the development of the self-concept is the significance of the person in the light of the individual. I know of a father who had three very handsome sons, but all of them are now in psychiatric difficulty, because the father did not end up as that significant other person in the life of any of his sons. As he found out who the significant other person was, he always went up their back with the rate of destroying them, from character, and assassinating the character of the individuals to such an extent he never allowed his own son to have another significant person in their lives. This is one of the things that I always do in counseling particularly when I have a problematical student and I ask, "Who is the important person in your life?" It may be a gambler, it may be the prostitute on the street, but I need to know, because in many instances that's the person through whom I will have to communicate with that student. Sometimes, I'm not able to establish communication, but the significant other person can.

May I also say that environmental press, the potency of the surroundings becomes significant to me. Out of our poverty, out of the state of want can come great contributions, for man can stand anything except continuous prosperity, and I am of the idea that out of the want comes the development of a reach. Therefore, I am concerned about what is the environment press of an individual. I had two youngsters from Arkansas come to spend two weeks with us two weeks ago. The rural community from which they came has produced five PhD's, one of the four that Harvard has produced in the School of Business and only week before last Wayne University conferred a Doctorate on a 22-year old in chemistry from this rural community. One of them had a list of all the places in Houston that they were to visit. Some of the places I didn't even know were in Houston. Here he made it his business to be taken to these all during his visit. But there was a brother with him who wasn't concerned as to whether he went to any of these. When we did go to planetariums and so forth, he fell asleep while the other one watched. I was determined to find out when I went back the environment expects something of the one who had the list and though they are two brothers, the environment has already written the second one off as a failure and at the rate they are going, he will be the failure because they are not expecting. I am not sure that the one that they have written off hasn't more intellectual ability than the other, but somehow or another, his physical characteristics or something else, have not appealed.

I also want you to take into consideration the physical characteristics of the individual and how the individual feels toward his physical characteristics. In our situation and working relations now, we are discovering that for a time, the shade of the Negro was important, and studies were made wtih regards to it — the lighter the Negro the better off he was in fairing socially and in acceptability. The new militancy and the 'black power' element have changed the picture, and now the darker the greater the possibility of acceptance in the society, and these things make a difference. Dr. Daniels is here, but you should see Howard University's queen for next year — she's completly changing the version of Howard University. The physical characteristics of the individual need to be taken into consideration. He obviates difference in a similar environment, for it is quite often stated, "We now know that the degree of similarity one perceives between himself and the teacher influences ones functioning." Adequate functioning is associated with moderate similarity.

If I had the time, I would want to bring to your attention the importance of intellectual capacity, and the degree of cognition in the formation of the self-concept. The degrees of the present failures have been dealt with quite well by Dr. Combs, but I just must say one word about stereo-typing and generalization. Even in the book *The Negro Self-Concept*, there reads a statement that represents to me a kind of stereo-typing. "Negro boy appears to be far more vulnerable to social disorganization. This can be accounted for in part by the fact male models available for the growing boy are themselves demoralized. A father who feels defeated by the world is not in a good position to give his son a sense of optimisim and a feeling that he can achieve something himself." These kind of statements do not address themselves to the exception, or what is now becoming an everyday practice. In other words, I'm saying that as we look for the development of the self-concept, let's not allow ourselves to pick at the psychic scab, because there are individuals who have no psychic scab, and their concepts and self-development can proceed along normal lines. Every Negro child does not have the psychic scars, and ought not to be treated accordingly, and there should not be generalization along this line.

I should say education has a vital part to play and we must not assume that the child, by whatever disadvantages he comes to us, is fixed, as Dr. Combs has mentioned. I'd like to suggest to you four things in the education realm that we can address ourselves to in helping this development. The living witness kind of idea, where you bring in these models that have not been present and bring in individuals who represent success stories, who may have come from the urban rural Negro situation that represents success, and let them see that these individuals made it in spite of these. You, too, can make it if you can look at life in a positive vein.

Travel is good. Whether the parents can afford it or not, maybe some of the money that we are talking about that we can get from other sources ought to be invested in the travel of youth. Many states are doing this now, through bus trips across the country. To come out of an environment and see can be one of the most stimulating and helpful things. Don't forget the textbook material. I have to tell you again about my three and a half year old. He was crying for a magazine that one of the college fellows had, and the fellow didn't want to give up the magazine, and he whisked it away and gave him another. He started thumbing through the pages and handed it back to him and said, "This book ain't got no souls represented." Somewhere along the line he has discounted printed material that does not in any sense reflect the Negro.

Look out for your textbooks and what they will do to the ego of the individual, which in no sense depicts the presence of one similar to himself, and this means that compensatory education must address itself to educational materials that include individuals who are similar, too. And most of all, don't forget your own attitude. The teacher who is going to help the individual in the development of his own self-concept, must be absent in terms of ethnic, regional, religious, political or social class biases, and don't forget it. Students are able to pick out phonies from a mile away and yet, in the classroom, they forget your racial identity. In trying to impress upon my 11-year-old daughter the kindness and the attitude of white toward Negroes, I said to her, "Mrs. Blade, our next door neighbor, is white and look at her attitude." She went away and stayed for about two hours and finally she came back to me and said, "Daddy, is Mrs. Blade white?" And we had lived four years next door to her, and she had all the characteristics, and the Nordic features. But you can live in such an extent that your racial identity is not even observable to them or identifiable. Yes, we're asking you to do a lot now in terms of compensatory education, and now we come in with the self-concept.

Rosa Parks, the woman who began the boycott of the Buckleys in Montgomery, once said, "My feet are tired, but my soul is rested." The realization of all the things that we can accomplish in education, though we may have 18 or 20 years service and may be viewing retirement, we will be able to say that our feet are tired but our souls are rested because we have now recognized some of the things that we can accomplish that were, heretofore, marked as impossible. If we are going to have the right of self-determination, we are going to have to work on the development of the self-concept as a phase and a part of the compensatory education.

COMMENTARY THREE

by

WILLIAM T. CARSE

A response to Dr. Combs' speech allows me a great deal of freedom as well as imposing tremendous restrictions upon me. The freedom comes from my interpretation of his remarks and a long familiarity with his ideas. The restriction is imposed by the context in which the speech is presented and the knowledge of the positions of the speaker in regard to some topics under consideration. So that you can sort out from my remarks that which is directed toward Dr. Combs' presentation and that which is my opinion or distorted perceptions, let me include a little about myself. About sixteen years ago, in 1949, to be more exact, I was introduced to a book by an excellent teacher. Both the book and the teacher had profound influence upon my professional life. The book, as you will have guessed, was *Individual Behavior* co-authored by Dr. Combs. This knowledge of the self-concept development as expressed here in his presentation causes my reaction to be essentially some descriptions of my translations of his ideas.

At this Conference I find that my background can be labelled. I am of the Ozarkan poor. This, too, will color my reactions and add even more to my tendency to interpret the world in simple terms couched in broad generalizations.

Before any mention of Dr. Combs' points, may I take a few seconds to discuss one of my deep preujdices. The most unfortunate term to be applied to any group of people in our present efforts to be of assistance to these people is the term *culturally disadvantaged.* I do not believe that it is possible to be culturally disadvantaged. I would not argue with the idea of being educationally and financially disadvantaged or deprived. I would hope that we are using culture to mean a particular stage of advancement in civilization or as the characteristics of that stage. Since to be alive is to be at a stage of civilization it sounds smug for any one group of us to call another group culturally disadvantaged. I wonder what criteria are being applied for evaluation. In education we find clearly stated and accepted criteria, usually arbitrary, but when we consider culture no such clarity is present. I would hope that in my dealings with people, I first see the person then the visible appurtenances of his culture. We may have problems communicating because of cultural differences but I am sure we will have a better basis for the establishment of communication if we have regard for the person.

Now, to my reaction. Since this is a conference on educational objectives let me try to present the type of educational objective that I see growing out of the Combs' self-concept development approach to education. I am uneducated until I can describe in symbols either in the form of physical movements or in words, written or oral, the personal perceptions of my perceptual fields — now called cognitions. These symbol systems are the cognitive maps which circumscribe my changing fields. To be of use to me these cognitive maps must be of a kind that may be communicated. If it cannot be, then I cannot describe, share, or teach any portion of my world.

Could we, then, simply say that the objective of education is the development of a symbol system large enough to encompass most of each person's field in terms of their individual realities and congruent enough with the systems of others to allow communication and consequently the cooperative development of new definitions of reality.

Could it be further stated, both in terms of theory and research results, that the introjection of these symbols will be in accord with our perceptions of ourselves as 'a person who talks in symbols.' Or, more simply, that each of us possess a self-concept that could be termed learner.

Notice that this objective uses the present world of the learner. In the teacher-pupil relationship the controlling elements must be in the pupil's hands since his is the more limited system. Controlling elements here are used to mean the point of departure for increased symbolization not the ultimate goal to be reached in the educational process. The teacher functions as a translator should always be used for the word teacher.

There are some characteristics of the learner that Dr. Combs would have us honor. The pupil, unless he is severely damaged, is always ready to learn. In fact, he must learn. One of our problems is that he is not particularly motivated to learn that which we, the school people, have defined as what he should know. There are several important reasons for this. There may be little or no congruence between our perceptual systems. Also, if he has not found in his experiences that he meets with any success in his attempts to learn the symbols of the world that the school is imposing on him, he will find ways of erecting barriers between himself and what the teacher is attempting to translate to him. As William Keeler mentioned, if he "has no experience with success" he will most likely attempt to maintain the self-concept of no success. He has no other self-concept associated with school toward which he can move.

Here, unfortunately, many of our school evaluation programs are designed to implant more deeply the notion of failure. Can you imagine living for five to seven hours per day for 180 or more days in a room or an environment wherein every effort to do something was met with a negative evaluation? Maybe we who teach should try that just once since it is the world we impose on many of the young persons who enter our schools and it is exactly the world we did not know when we were students. We know that our experiences in that classroom were successful because we are still in those rooms. Isn't it our responsibility as teachers to discover the areas in which we could provide success so that the child may begin to develop a small reserve of experiences with success. And it is exactly at this point that our subtle divisions of children into advantaged and disadvantaged plays its worst havoc. Since all of our symbolizations are showing, cognitive and affective, the child reads our negative evaluations from our behaviors and then acts in accord. Again he is denied experience with success since he cannot find even positive affective feedback.

As implied earlier the concept of teacher as defined in layman terms probably does not fit into the scheme of things as set up by the self-concept theorists. The present definition of the teacher as the learned one in the subject area does not allow for the kind of behavior we would hope a student would develop in school. It is possible for the teacher in the classroom today to be the least informed about a topic. Mass communication methods have made this possible. For example, if you will remember back to the days just following President Kennedy's assassination you will quickly recall that television was offering total coverage. The child who had time to watch these hours of history in the making was far better informed about the events and those related to it than was the teacher who did not have time to watch television.

It is evident to me, then, that the teacher must demonstrate that learning is a cooperative and continuing affair. I, the teacher, will continue to learn new materials about my interest areas for so long as I shall live. We need to remove the now synonymous meaning between school and learning. We need teachers who provide an acceptable model of learning or one more in line with Combs' ideas. We need to possess a learning self-concept that will allow our students to develop the same self-concept of learner that we want each teacher to possess. To do this the teacher will, of course, act as a representative of the adult world—a representative of the world but not a policeman for that world.

During my tours of public schools I have heard much about students' inability to read. However, during my many long hours as a visitor in the classrooms at all levels of school I have yet to see a teacher reading in the manner he wants his students to reach. I wonder if it wouldn't help to let the students see what reading can accomplish — even for the teacher.

I like the idea of material-to-be-learned rather than subject matter or area of study. All that can be known about any thing that exists is already present in that thing. Likewise, all that can be known about any human behavior at the moment of behaving is already present in the behavioral situation. The fact that I do not have this information is the fault of me and my educational and learning processes and not of the material-to-be-learned. If my differentiations had been adequate I would know all that there is to know about the thing or the behavior. In all areas of knowledge we are not near the point where we know all that could be known. In the areas of psychology and education our knowledge is at a primitive stage. Since it is true that all of our present knowledges are filled with inaccurate bits of information, we must somehow develop within the learner the idea that their responsibility is to attempt to discover those areas where reality is incorrectly defined, then attempt to correct the error. We could, if you will, also say that we need to develop other more fully functioning inaccuracies.

With this idea of material-to-be-learned another concern presents itself. The idea of difficulty takes on other dimensions. The level of difficulty would not exist in the material-to-be-learned. Rather it exists in either the incomplete or inaccurate differentiations that are within the student. No material is any more difficult to learn than any other if you possess the basic differentiations and symbols which allow you to learn the new materials. Often you hear a college professor say that it is good to tell students that this will be difficult material so that when the students learn the material they will be very complimented that they could learn such difficult material. What a subtle way for a professor to compliment himself! This is difficult but I know it and if you study real hard you will know it just as I do. What a fallacious way to teach! If we all knew things just like our teachers and professors know them, progress would be slow or non-existent.

I would expect that with any teaching method we will always find that pupils learn. I further expect that we will always find that the results of any study of our teaching methods will be positive. Among our students there will always be those who so identify with teachers that these students will learn our new ways well enough to tip the scale of experimentation in the favor of the methods being used at the moment. I fear that we do not measure the results of the method that is used. In educational research we describe a method for our experimental teaching, we attempt to translate this into some kind of teacher behavior, we teach a teacher to use these new behaviors that we feel are in line with the original descriptions of the method; then, we place the teacher before the students. We test the students behavior before we teach and we test them when the teacher completes the unit. After all this we act surprised when we find that the method works. The question we have not answered is; what worked?

Self-perception theory gives us, I believe, a realistic answer to that question. What works is the students' need to learn. The new methods, simply because of their newness, make it necessary for the teacher to demonstrate learning behavior rather than teaching behavior in the presence of the students. With the ever present model of a learning-teacher rather than a transmitter-of-knowledge teacher, the students will change in the direction of the teacher's learning behavior. Then, surprise of surprises, intelligence quotients increase, achievement test scores zoom upward, culturally different students are suddenly acculturated and all manner of wonderful things happen.

When the teacher is a learner, evaluation changes radically. When the criteria are in the process of definition through the cooperative actions of the teacher and the pupil, behavior is bound to change in the direction of the adult model. After all, isn't the self-perception of American children of all cultures built upon the dependency of child on adult.

Tucked away in the last chapters of Marston Bates' book, *The Forest and the Sea,* is the comment that the two most adaptable creatures in this world are man and rodents. He further comments that much of our experimentation is inadequate because we have failed to recognize this point. I think that Sydney Jourard has developed this idea to an even more damaging point. He has said in meetings with a college staff that all psycholological research lacks validity because the researcher failed to fully inform the subjects of the purpose of the research. Not having a definition, the subjects proceeded to behave in line with their perceptions of the types of results that the researcher wanted. Could it be that this tells us why most reported experiments in learning these days end with some comment about the increase in intelligence quotients and achievement. Surely both increase. Didn't the experimenters tell the subjects in a thousand ways that this was the expected behavioral result. Being adaptive, wouldn't it be expected that the children would perform in more intelligent ways even to responding more intelligently to a measure of intelligence. I wonder if we shouldn't check out this idea of adaptability. Perhaps all we have measured in most of our educational research is the adaptability factor which may be fairly constant across persons.

I have found the ideas of self-concept development as expressed by Dr. Combs most productive. You, I am sure, will find this true also. You are a patient and wonderful audience. I would assume you are equally patient and wonderful as teachers, school administrators and researchers.

Chaper Four

COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS AS AN OBJECTIVE

TEACHING COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS TO DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

by

SIEGRIED ENGELMANN

The general failure to attack and solve such problems as teaching effective communication skills to disadvantaged children is primarily the result of a fuzzy statement about what teaching is and how the nature of the teaching situation imposes limitations on what the educator, the curriculum designer, and the teacher can do. A set of ground rules is derived from a clear statement of what teaching is. These ground rules should be followed not because they are "rigorous" or because they may have a certain amount of intellectual appeal, but because they are necessary in a very practical sense. The rule that a scientist must report what he sees and not what he would like to see is based on such necessity, and one can appreciate what would happen if we didn't want to impose dogmatic procedures on the chemist, for example. Instead of requiring him to report the exact amount contained in a beaker, we could allow him to use his own intuition or to use another "theoretical model" when reporting the amount. The stipulation about reporting amounts accurately is introduced for only one reason. *Without the stipulation, great ambiguity could result.* Stipulations about handling educational problems are introduced for the same reason. It is possible to demonstrate that by introducing them, sources of confusion that would otherwise obtain are eliminated.

The basic rule for solving educational problems is that every phase of the teaching procedure — from the establishment of objectives to the teacher's presentation — *must be described in terms of specific concepts.* Any departure from this rule results in varying degrees of chaos. The objectives must be set up in terms of the specific concepts the child is expected to master; the analysis of the tasks must be expressed in terms of specific concepts; the primary evaluation of the program must be expressed in terms of specific concepts; the performance of the children must be expressed in terms of mastery of specific concepts; and the teacher's presentation must be expressed in terms of specific concepts. The entire process, in other words, must be expressed in terms of what the children are expected to know, and what they know (inferred from their behavior).

The reason that the entire process must be expressed in these terms is actually quite basic: the educator, the curriculum designer, and the teacher *deal only in concepts.* They are expected to induce specific concepts, and they are expected to evaluate the child's behavior in terms of the concepts he has or has not learned. Sometimes, the teaching procedure is expressed in terms of behavior, but the strictly behavioral interpretation does not tell the curriculum analyst how he should go about developing an *adequate* presentation, and it does not provide the teacher with a sufficient basis for knowing how to correct a child who makes a mistake. In some teaching situations, the teacher's presentation may have been consistent with more than one concept and the child may have selected the wrong interpretation. Unless the teaching procedure is expressed in terms of concepts, the teacher knows only that the child is not producing the appropriate behavior; the adequacy of her presentation may not be considered, and she may not know what to do to correct the child's error.

There is one legitimate paradigm for constructing teaching programs. This paradigm is outlined below, followed by a discussion of some of the difficulties that are encountered if the paradigm is not followed.

Step one in constructing a program — objectives

The first step in constructing a program is to specify the objectives. The objectives represent an *absolute criterion of performance* that is to be achieved by the children through training. In other words, after training they are supposed to be able to do things they couldn't do before — not any old thing, but very specific things. If the objective is to teach certain communication skills, the children must be taught these skills. They have no choice in the matter. And the program is a failure if these skills are not induced. If a program to teach certain communication skills fails to teach these skills but succeeds in teaching the children how to do freehand sketches, the program failed to do what it set out to do and must be considered a failure, even though the children learned something. This point can be seen by considering a more obvious example. Suppose that every child in the class learned something, but no two children learned the same thing and none of the children could demonstrate at the end of the program that he had learned the criterial skills he was supposed to have been taught. The program is a failure, because if the objectives of the program are legitimate, the children will be expected *to use* the criterial skills in working future problems. If they haven't learned the criterial skills, they will not be able to use them, *which means that they will not be able to meet the next set of educational objectives.* The program, therefore, was a failure.

Since objectives must be absolute, they cannot possibly be derived from a study of the child. They are imposed as statements of what we want all children to learn. The word *all* must be emphasized. We cannot have one objective for some children and another objective for others. It is possible that some children will not achieve all of the educational objectives that are established, and since children differ in their repertoire of skills, it is axiomatic that a greater amount of teaching will be required to bring some children to the desired criterion of performance. But the objectives hold for all children. Through education, we would like to be able to teach disadvantaged Negro children the same set of skills we require for middle class white children.

For objectives to be acceptable in the educational setting, they must be stated in terms of specific tasks the children should be able to handle after training. This stipulation is introduced to avoid confusion. Let's say that the objective is presented as a general statement rather than a series of specific tasks. "The objective of this program is to teach children basic communication skills." The person who is charged with developing a program to meet this objective may interpret the objective in terms of communication as used in social interaction. He may interpret it in terms of the type of communication skills that are used in the beginning instructional setting. He may interpret communication broadly, interpreting it to mean behavior in the interpersonal situation, and he may provide instruction in general interpersonal behavior — verbal and non-verbal. These are a few of the options that are open to him. Since he has such options, it is always possible to argue that the instruction failed. One can argue that it did not teach a certain type of communication. One can always construct a "communication" problem that would be failed by the children, and we would not be able to state whether a given test gave a fair evaluation of the program. We know only that the program should teach communication skills.

These and other difficulties can be avoided if the objectives of a program are expressed as specific tasks. For example, "The child should be able to answer the question, 'Is this a ________?' in connection with familiar objects. His answer should be expressed correctly as either, 'Yes, this is a ________,' or 'No, this is not a ________.' "

A given program may have many such objectives, as many as are needed to show what the program is to teach. By detailing the objective in this manner, the educator makes it possible for the program to be rigorous. The objectives serve as the basis for analyzing what the children have to learn, and therefore as the basis for the curriculum development. One knows by examining the objectives what the child must learn. The objectives serve as the basis for testing children to see whether or not the instruction has succeeded. One can no longer legitimately introduce extraneous tests of communication mastery. And the objectives serve as a basis for directing the activity of the teacher. She knows what the end product of her teaching is supposed to be.

Objectives that cannot be translated into specific tasks cannot be allowed in program construction. The objective of teaching the whole child, stimulating self realization, and providing readiness can be accepted as objectives only if they can be translated into specific tasks The argument sometimes presented by educators that not everything can be measured and that it does violence to such concepts as the "whole child" to try to reduce it to a series of tasks is not convincing. Without such tests, the eduator is never quite sure whether the program he advocates is actually the one that achieves the desired learning. *It is quite possible, in absence of specific measures, that the program he most strongly opposes is actually the most effective in teaching the whole child.* In fact, unless specific measures are provided, every program can claim that it teaches the whole child. Similarly, the objective of providing "meaningful experiences" can be claimed by any program unlesss this objective is translated into a series of specific tasks.

There is another important point about objectives, which is that the objectives of a training program must be demonstrably consistent with the assumed priorities of skills valued in our society. Educators must recognize that they are not policy makers. They cannot make up objectives that are inconsistent with society's general commitment to make children competent in the academic arena. This stipulation, again, is introduced because of the confusion that can result if it were not introduced. If educators and teachers are allowed to make up policy, it is possible that they will introduce objectives that are not consistent with the general set of educational values espoused by society, or they may introduce objectives that cannot be realized through education. The objective of teaching the child to cope with his home environment probably cannot be achieved through classroom education, simply because the education is limited to the classroom, not the "home environment." Therefore, many of the problems encountered in the home environment cannot be demonstrated and the rules of behavior necessary to handle certain situations cannot be reinforced. It would be possible to teach the child *facts* about how to cope with his home environment, but it cannot effectively teach the *behaviors* that constitute effective coping. The objective of focusing education on dance and basket weaving is not consistent with society's general commitment to competence. The skills learned in dance and basket weaving are not *used* in higher order tasks, such as writing expositions on the college level, solving quadratic equations, or doing assignments in history.

Two questions must be answered affirmatively about the objectives of an educational program: (1) Does it provide a precise standard for evaluating the performance of the children? (2) Does it teach skills that will be used in future educational tasks?

Although there is a great deal of concern about the long-range objectives of early and remedial education, the problem is rather trivial. All children should learn a set of skills that is sufficient to allow them admittance to college. If they do not go to college it should not be because they have failed to learn the appropriate skills.

Step two in constructing a program — analysis

If the objectives are stated as legitimate tasks, the next step follows naturally. That is the step of breaking the objectives into the constituent concepts (the concepts that are used in the criterion task or objective). When the objective is stated as tasks, the concepts involved in these tasks can be rigorously analyzed. For example, the following may be one of several hundred criterial tasks for a unit in the following instructions: "Draw a straight horizontal line on your paper."

To determine conceptual components of this task, one simply specifies the concepts that are used in the task. If it is used, it must be taught before it can be used. It, therefore, must be prerequisite to the criterial task. This is not a mere empirical fact; it is a logical necessity.

The major concepts or operations involved in the task above are these:

> The child must understand the word *draw*; he must know the kind of behavior that is demanded by the signal "Draw   ," and be able to demonstrate his understanding by following such instructions as, "Draw a circle," "Draw a boy," "Draw a line."
>
> The child must understand the word *line*; he must be able to identify things that are lines and distinguish between lines and things that are not lines (such as ropes, sidewalks, and other objects that may look like lines when they are represented in a drawing).
>
> The child must be able to demonstrate that he understands what the words *a line* mean. He must demonstrate that he can discriminate between the singular "a line" and the plural "lines," "three lines," "some lines," etc.
>
> The child must understand what *straight* means. He must be able to discriminate between things that are straight and not straight.
>
> The child must understand that "straight, horizontal line" calls for a line that is both straight *and* horizontal. He must be able to demonstrate that he can discriminate between "straight, horizontal

lines," "not-straight, horizontal lines," and "not-straight, not horizontal lines."

The child must understand the concept *on*. He must be able to demonstrate that he can point to things that are on something and things that are not on something. He must be able to tell what object the things are on. (The coat is on (the floor, the table, John etc.)).

The child must demonstrate that he understands the instructions, "Draw on   ." He must demonstrate that he can distinguish between "draw on   " and "sit on   ," "put your hand on   ," and "push on   ," etc. He must also demonstrate that he can handle the instructional form "Draw   on   ," in which different object words are introduced in the blanks.

The child must understand the meaning of the word paper.

The child must demonstrate that he understands the word *your*. He must be able to discriminate between instructions containing *your, my, his, the, a, all, some, any*, etc.

While the procedure of analyzing the criterion task (objective) in terms of its constituent operations may seem laborious, it is necessary if the program is to be solid. Instruction is based on analysis. Unless the analysis accounts for the teaching of every skill required to handle the criterion problems, however, the analysis will not imply adequate instruction. Stated differently, a child may fail the criterion task for many different reasons. He may not understand the word straight, for example. He may not understand what the teacher means by "draw a line." He may not know what "your paper" refers to. The training which the child received must systematically eliminate each of the possible causes of failure. The training will be able to do this consistently only *if all possible causes of failure are identified*. They will be identified if the criterion task is carefully analyzed in terms of the concepts that are involved in it.

The analysis is only partially completed with the identification of the concepts that are used in the criterion task. To teach each of these constituent concepts, the teacher must use concrete demonstrations. That is, she must present specific objects and specific statements in connection with these. However, specific tasks are not implied by the identification procedure, which means that it is possible for one to make up more than one presentation for teaching the meaning of *straight, horizontal*, etc. Furthermore, each of these presentations may contain words and operations that are not included in the criterion task. For example, in teaching the word *straight*, the teacher may present the question, "Show me the lines that are not straight." New concepts are introduced in this task. "Show me . . .," "lines," "that," and "not straight." Provisions must be made for the teaching of each of these concepts.

Since the teacher must demonstrate each of the constituent concepts, *the curriculum designer must present every constituent concept as a task* — a demonstration complete with statements and objects that are to be presented. In this way he will be able to see whether concepts that do not appear in the criterion problem must be taught. In this way he will be able to provide for the teaching of these new concepts. He will be able to analyze the constituent tasks in the same way he analyzed the criterion tasks. The ordering of the tasks comes about naturally from the type of concept analysis that is conducted. If a concept (operation, skill) is called for in a complex task, that operation precedes the complex task in the presentation sequence.

To assure that each constituent concept will be taught, *each presentation* specified in the analysis must be designed so that it is consistent with one and only one interpretation. If the presentation could possibly admit to more than one interpretation, it will probably fail to teach *all* children the desired skills, which means that the presentation is not adequate. If the presentation calls for one object in teaching the concept red, the child could legitimately conclude that red is another name for that particular object, that red has something to do with the shape or texture of the object, or that red refers to the color of the objects. Unles the presentation rules out all possible incorrect interpretations by demonstrating with a variety of objects that the invariant referred to as "red" is the color and only the color, the presentation is not acceptable. If appropriate statements have been programmed, some incorrect interpretations may be ruled out with statements. However, physical demonstrations are usually necessary (especially when the curriculum designer is dealing with basic sensory concepts).

The specification of tasks that are to be presented to the children is governed by the principle of *presentational economy*. According to this principle, there are operations that are essential to the understanding of concepts and there are features that are not essential. For example, the ability to use syntactical forms is essential to successful performance on communication tasks; however, the ability *to explain the usage in terms of syntax or grammar* is not. The former ability would have to be programmed in a program designed to teach communication skills; the latter would not because it is possible to teach all relevant skills involved in the criterion without referring to grammar or syntax.

Also, the principle of presentational economy would dictate that any procedure that can increase the potential rate of new learning is preferable to techniques that are potentially slower. The potential rate of the presentation is determined by the amount of new learning involved in the tasks. Presentational economy is achieved by treating aspects of tasks that are the same in the same way. Since they are treated in the same way, less new learning is implied because elements are repeated from presentation to presentation. Stated differently, when one classifies tasks according to how they are the same, he is able to construct a basic set of procedures that apply to all instances included in the category. When one does not proceed in this manner, however, he must start from scratch on each problem and provide for a great deal more teaching. All opposites are the same in terms of the type of reasoning that is involved. If one is told that something is not wet, he knows that it is dry. He can draw this conclustion from the *not* statement. Since all opposites share this characteristic, they can be presented using variations of the same statement forms and variations of the same basic demonstrational procedures.

Using the procedure of analysis outlined above, one can work from any complex task down to the level where a rat could start on the program. Furthermore, it is possible to determine precisely how close any individual is to criterial performance and to specify precisely what he must learn in order to handle the criterion task. In other words, precise testing and teaching are implied by this method of analysis, and only by this method of analysis.

Step three in constructing a program — try-out

The analysis of the objective or criterion task provides one with a list of prerequisite skills and the specification of tasks designed to teach each skill. However, the analysis does not tell anything about the relative "psychological difficulty" of each task. It does not tell him which tasks will be relatively easy for the children and which will be relatively difficult. The degree of difficulty for the tasks is discovered by presenting the tasks to children. What often happens is that the children will go through an entire sequence of tasks in a few minutes only to bog down on the following task for a few days — or weeks. When such rough spots are encountered, the curriculum designer should first assume that his analysis is inadequate. He should *blame himself* and assume that the children are having difficulties because he is asking them to learn more than one new concept at a time or that he is asking them to take more than one small step at a time.

Here's the type of problem that may be encountered. The program calls for the teacher to teach number identification using the statement form, "This number is ." However, young, disadvantaged children may fail to learn numbers simply because the task is requiring them to learn a new way of identifying things and at the same time, is requiring them to learn the names of the new objects. As a result, the children may not realize that the task calls for the same identification process they use in other situations. They may conclude that the statement is somehow a part of the identification procedure and that the exercise is a word game, not an identification task. This error can be corrected by changing the identification procedure so that it is more similar to the procedure the children are used to using — by requiring a single-word response: "What is this . . . Three." Now the children can concentrate on the identification of the object not on the compound task of concentrating on the identification and the production of an unfamiliar statement.

Through try-out the curriculum designer is able to give his program the refinements that do not come from the analysis of constituent concepts. If the children find the task he presents dull, he must do something to liven them up, perhaps changing the pace of tasks in the program so that children are not operating on the same level of intensity at all times. If the children aren't serious about what is being taught, he must devise exercises in which there is a strong pay-off for using the skills that are taught and a negative pay-off for failing to use them properly. It may be that the curriculum designer fails to figure out how to lead children to certain constituent concepts without difficulties or extensive drill. This does not mean that the book is closed or that another curriculum designer will be unable to devise a series of tasks that works; it merely means that for the present, the educator must work with the program as it is, recognizing its specific shortcomings.

Step four in constructing a program — programming the teacher

The next step in the development of a program is to assure that the teacher can present concepts effectively and diagnose the children's responses in terms of precisely what they have been taught and what they have not been taught. The teacher must be thoroughly familiar with the steps a child must take to reach the criterion of performance set for a given task. Without detailed understanding, she may waste time and present tasks that are cumbersome. She may present questions that can be failed for a number of reasons — questions that contain words and concepts which have not been programmed.

If the program is adequate, the teacher should be able to test a child's mastery of a given concept by presenting a question or a direction to do something that can be failed *for only one reason.* If it can be failed for more than one reason, the teacher does not know precisely what to teach the child. She has options, and she may choose the incorrect option. She may think that she knows why the child failed the item, but she may be quite wrong. She may have designed the question to get at the child's understanding of a particular concept, but unless the child understands everything in the question except that concept, he may fail for unsuspected reasons. For example, if the teacher asks the child, "Are there more red beads or are there more beads made of wood?" She may think that she is testing the child's understanding of class inclusion, but unless she knows that the child understands every constituent concept in the question — the concepts *more, beads, or, made of wood,* etc. — the child may fail the item for other reasons than the intended one. If she proceeds on the assumption that the child failed the item because he does not understand the concept of class inclusion, she is therefore operating from a position of ignorance.

The program is an adequate buttress against such errors by programming the concepts one at a time, so that the teacher knows that the children understand all of the concepts in her statements except for one — the one she is currently teaching. However, the program is never perfect, and the teacher must be able to diagnose the performance of the children in terms of what they don't know. She needs more than quantitative data. She must be able to infer from a child's responses to a series of questions *what he thinks the concept is.* She must then be able to provide a series of demonstrations that contradict his interpretation and point out what the acceptable interpretation is. For example, if his behavior is consisent with the interpretation that *red* is another word for "ball," she must quickly demonstrate that things that cannot be called "ball" can be called "red" and that not all balls are called "red." Inferring concepts from children's performance is not easy; it requires a great deal of practice in formulating tentative interpretations, providing appropriate questions to test these hypotheses and then providing the demonstration that corrects the misinterpretation.

To teach properly, the teacher must hold her "intuition" in check. She may have learned in teacher training that she should do what comes naturally to her. Nothing could be further from the truth. She must satisfy the requirements of the program in a way that comes naturally to her. However, she must stifle the impulse to refer to operations and to use words that have not been programmed. She must learn to work fast, so that the children can receive as much practice as she can cram into a session, and so that the point is obvious when she is treating things in an analogous way. If the instances of an analogy are spaced several minutes apart, it may be some time before the child is able to get the point. If the instances follow each other at an interval of only a few seconds, however, the point is more obvious. There is less intervening noise for the child to deal with. Most important, the teacher must realize that those children she is working with — those complex beings — *must be reduced to precise statements of what they don't know.* Such statements are necessary if she is to bring every child to the desired level of performance in the least amount of time. In summary, the teacher must be a highly trained technician, not a combination of educational philosopher and social worker. She must recognize that she is responsible for a unique contribution to the child's welfare — that of teaching him essential concepts and skills. If she fails to satisfy this need, she will have failed, regardless of how well-meaning she is or how many visits to the home she makes. If she doesn't *teach* relevant skills, nobody will.

Step five in constructing a program — evaluation

The final step in constructing a program is to evaluate the results of the program. The most significant measure from an educational standpoint is the measure of whether the children achieved the desired criteria of performance. Such a detailed achievement evaluation is of primary importance because it comments on what the children know, which means that it provides a clear basis for formulating the next set of educational objectives. If children have mastered basic algebra by the end of the second grade, objectives in which basic algebra concepts are used can be established. The tasks in a program are presented because they teach concepts that are to be used in future tasks. The evaluation, therefore, must provide detailed information about whether or not the children met the criteria of performance. If they have, then they are ready to move on to tasks in which they will use what they learned. If they have not met the criteria of performance they must work on these before proceeding

The evaluation of the program in terms of IQ gain or amorphous achievement is interesting but not particularly pertinent to the problem of teaching children because they provide a gross indication of what happened during the training, but they do not relate the performance of each child to the specific criteria of instruction that had been established. The criterion-referenced measure, on the other hand, evaluates the instruction in terms of the criteria of performance that grew out of the objectives.

Summary on constructing a program

Conventions or rules of constructing a program are introduced because they are needed. Without them, confusion results. The primary conventions are these:

(1) The objectives must be stated as a series of specific tasks which are capable of determining whether the child has mastered the desired learning.

(2) Everything that follows — the analysis, the development of specific teaching presentations, and the teacher's behavior — derive from the objective tasks.

(3) The analysis is conducted by noting every concept that is used in the objective problems.

(4) Tasks that are to be used to teach these concepts must be specified.

(5) The presentation of tasks for a given concept must be sufficient, that is, it must admit to one and only one interpretation.

(6) For clarity and maximum informational feedback from the performance of children, the program should be designed so that the child learns one new concept at a time.

(7) The teacher must infer concept mastery of the children from their performance; she must provide appropriate remedies for children who have developed misconceptions or inadequate formulations of a given concept. She must recognize that she deals only in concepts and that the child's responses must be interpreted in terms of concepts.

(8) The program must be evaluated in terms of whether or not the children reached the various criteria of performance specified by the objective problems and the tasks that derived from these.

Abuses in program construction

The educator who recognized the necessity of the rules outlined above is able to operate from a position of strength. He knows where his ballpark is and what it looks like. Consequently, he knows whether a given approach belongs in his ballpark or belongs somewhere else. He doesn't accept theoretical approaches unless they conform to the ground rules that he obtains in his ballpark. This is perhaps the most difficult point for educators to understand. Merely because a theory or (in most cases) a series of organized observations seem plausible is no reason for accepting them. For them to be acceptable they must be compatible with the limitations imposed by the unique nature of the program-construction situation.

Although the procedure for developing sound programs is not particularly abstruse, it is not generally followed in solving educational problems, such as those confronting the culturally disadvantaged child.

Developmental approaches

The most common mistake that educators make is to work from theoretical explanations that are either irrelevant to or incomptaible with the nature of the teaching situation. For example, educators often turn to theoretical explanations of how children develop. While it is possible for the educator to use developmental norms to arrive at some conclusion about what a particular child knows, developmental explanations are totally irrelevant to the act of teaching children. The tests of a child's cognitive development are merely samples of what he has learned Like any other sample, they are subject to a probability phenomena. If a child scores poorly on a series of "cognitive" tests, the chances are that he will score poorly on concepts that have not been tested. The environment that has not taught skills *A* through *M* probably has not taught skill *N*. Any broad sample of knowledge will therefore have a certain amount of predictive validity. While the information provided by developmental measures may be of some use in placing a child (especially a child who scores at the extremes of the range), the information cannot be used in the teaching or program development situations (except to indicate specific items that the child has failed). Teaching is based on the assumption that through the appropriate manipulation of environmental variables, the desired concepts can be taught and desired behavior can be induced. In order to know what kind of environmental manipulation is necessary, however, the educator must know precisely what the child knows in relation to specific criteria of performance. Regardless of what else the educator knows, he must know this. The developmental tests don't usually provide relevant information. This point is illustrated by the following example. Suppose that 90 percent of the children who passed a given developmental test knew the concepts *before* and *after* as they are used to describe events that are sequenced. The teacher who is given information on how her children performed on the developmental test would still have to test the children in the class on their knowledge of *before* and *after*. She would be ill advised to suppose that all of the children in her class who passed the developmental test would know before and after. Possibly the test did not predict accurately with any of her children. The developmental test has no function in the teaching situation, because with it or without it, the teacher must test the concept understanding of every child in the class. The developmental test has neither provided a unique contribution nor served to eliminate a single step that the teacher would have to take if she didn't have the test.

The weakness of the developmental approach can be stated in a different way. The analysis of the criterion problem or objective reveals a minimum set of concepts the child must learn (and some additional concepts). It reveals the precise steps a child must take to reach the desired criterion of performance. Unless performance on a particular task is revealed in the analysis to be essential to mastery of the criterion problem, it is irrelevant to the mastery. Therefore, unless a particular developmental task is revealed in the analysis it is not one of the essential steps that a child must take to reach the desired criterion of performance. In the analysis of the instructions, "Draw a straight, horizontal line on you paper," one does not encounter such concepts as those involved in making judgments about the amounts of liquid in containers of different diameters. Therefore, the water level task, although it may be of some normative significance, is not essential to the criterion of performance.

The major difficulty with the developmental explanations is that they are based on the assumption that children learn. The teaching assumption is that children are taught. A child does not reach such specific criteria of performance as making correct judgments about liquid amounts unless he is taught. He must be taught the various words in the instructions; he must be taught, through one type of demonstration or another, that liquids are composed of "fixed units." He must be taught that the changes in the height of the column of liquid are compensated for by changes in the width. The developmental explanation supposes that these concepts are "learned." If they are learned, there is nothing we can do about the acquisition of "conservation" responses. If they are taught, however, we can treat the "conservation" responses like any other objective of training, state the objective as a task, analyze the task into constituent concepts, and provide instruction that will teach these in a manner far less haphazard than the normal teaching procedure. It is an empirical fact that such teaching will succeed. (Sullivan & Brison, 1967)

Developmental norms imply that there is a fixed order of development. From a teaching-oriented standpoint, they imply that there is a fixed order of "development" *under specific teaching conditions*. It is not possible to draw sweeping generalizations from this interpretation. It is certainly not possible to conclude that the order of development is invariant or that a child's performance reflects anything but the relative effectiveness of the teaching the child has received. The culturally disadvantaged child is, according to developmental explanations, developmentally impaired. He scores poorly on developmental measures. Does this mean that we should give up on him or wait for him to mature? Not if we believe in the process of teaching. We must simply identify the relevant criteria of performance on which he is weak, and provide the kind of careful instruction that will allow him to learn rapidly. If he learns rapidly enough, he will catch up. If we follow the developmental approach, we have to accept the child for what he is, which means that we give up.

The notion of readiness is based on the developmental assumption that something magical happens to a child with age. From the teaching-oriented view, nothing magical can happen. The child is simply taught more concepts that are relevant to instructional tasks, and that is all that can happen. Unless the child's performance is expressed in these terms, there is no remedy for the child who is not ready, except to let time exert its magic influence on his development. If criteria of performance are analyzed, however, the effects of time can be seen as specific concepts that have been taught. These can be taught in the gross readiness situation, in which the child must learn the skills incidentally. Or they can be taught directly. The direct approach represents an economy of effort and a focusing on what the child must learn to pass the criteria of performance.

There is a test to determine whether developmental approaches are relevant to problems of teaching. That is to ask, "Does the approach tell what the child must learn to meet a specific criterion of performance?" As a rule, therefore, developmental explanations do not imply the kind of remedy that can be provided through instruction.

The developmental approach is premised on the idea that objectives of education can be devised from a study of the child. This premise is flatly absurd. Objectives cannot be derived from statements about the child's performance. This is an analytical fact. Objectives are basically "ought" statements. The child ought to learn "*X*." Statements about children's performance, however are "is" statements — statements of fact. "The child is able to do *X*." It is impossible to derive *ought* statements from *is* statements, a fact that has been recognized for some time in philosophy, but which apparently has not been assimilated by the educator. To try to derive what children should learn from what they normally learn is to attempt the impossible and to commit gross reasoning errors in the process. The criteria of performance that is established as objectives of education are value judgments. They cannot be derived from a study of the child or from the "logic of the child." The "logic" is either acceptable or unacceptable in terms of specific criteria. If it is unacceptable, it must be changed through instruction.

The linguistic and psycholinguistic approaches

One of the most unfortunate tendecies of some educators who deal with communication problems is to refer to explanations used in linguistics and psycholinguistics. The argument is that there is something to be learned from these approaches, since they present a somewhat rigorous analysis of speech sounds and written symbols. This argument, although popular, is not sound. A given criterion of performance may involve the use of language, for example, "The investigator presents common objects such as balls, tables, etc., and the child indicates what these objects are, using statements." Language is involved, but with definite restrictions. *The language the child uses must be correct*, that is, it must describe the object that is being presented. The child cannot pass the criterion test merely using the appropriate statements, such as, "This is a ball." He must use this statement only when the investigator presents a ball. If the child responds to a table by saying, "This is a ball," his production was aceptable, from a linguistic standpoint; from an educational standpoint, however, it was unacceptable. Since the performance criterion for the task stipulates that the child must be able to use the statements appropriately, the kind of instruction that is implied is not merely one of learning sounds. It is one of learning the relationship between signals and observable aspects of reality. The child must understand what a ball is. He must be able to point to things that are balls and things that are not balls. In addition, he must be able to produce the statement that appropriately describes what he observes. The criterion militates against the possibility that the child receives instruction in sound production only. Yet, at best, sound production is all that linguistic theory can comment on, and even in this area, the comments would be extremely weak. This point is very obvious if one refers to any specific criterion of performance that is legitimately included in an educational program. The criterion always considers language as a *part* of the child's successful performance, never as the entire criterion. From analysis of the criterion we can see what the child must learn and how a teacher would go about correcting specific mistakes. Linguistic analysis implies neither of these procedures.

That the linguistic approach is basically irrelevant to education is nicely illustrated by the linguist's description of the child's use of open and pivot class construction. It is interesting to note that children learn syntactical patterns, but it is not particularly astonishing, nor does it imply any educational remedy for children who do not use language appropriately. An adequate explanation of why children use open-pivot class construction would have to include reference to the concepts the children are dealing with. On the linguistic level, it is basically inexplicable why children learn to use open-pivot class constructions. When one refers to concepts, however, it becomes evident that a given physical event represents the intersect of many concepts, and that each of these concepts can be found in other physical events. Given this fact, and the fact that a child learns to express these concepts it follows that *he has* to deal in open-pivot class constructions of one sort or another. The combinations that are possible in reality are possible in the child's speech. "Green chair, green table, green grass." "Truck bye-bye, Mommy bye-bye, Tommy bye-bye." To teach green, one must present various in stances of green. These are open-pivot constructions. "This chair is green, this table is green, this grass is green." When a child uses open-pivot class constructions, therefore, it means merely that he has been taught some of the basic facts about the world of concepts. It does not mean that he has been taught in the most economical or efficient way.

The psycholinguist sometimes tries to bridge the gap between what he can legitimately conclude and what he would like to be able to say about teaching by introducing the notion of *meaning*. For the psycholinguist meaning is something that is personal. You have your meaning and I have mine. By introducing this notion, the psycholinguist seems to believe that he is now able to comment on educational problems. But he can't, for the simple reason that his notion of meaning has no educational application. *All teaching deals with "public meaning,"* the meaning that everybody agrees upon. The concept red is not merely something that I believe. It refers to something that can be found in the world, that can be observed by various people. If the educator did not operate from this basic notion of meaning, he could not sanction any type of education. The teacher may believe that an object is blue, but if she accepts the personal definition of meaning, she would have to recognize that this is her interpreation. A child who calls the same object red has his "meaning" *and the teacher has absolutely no basis for telling the child that he is wrong* so long as meaning is defined in terms of one's personal responses to stimuli.

There is a nice test to demonstrate the irrelevant nature of linguistic and psycholinguistic attempts to set up educational programs. That is, one asks himself if it is possible, using the same statements the program uses — the same "theoretical" premises — to develop a program that is different or even diametrically opposed to the original on every suggested task. For example, if the linguist (after his flourish of "theoretical" premises) advocates the use of natural social situations to teach communication skills, see if it is possible to take his premises and derive a program based on precise programming of word sounds. In every case, opposite conclusions are possible, because the premises from which the linguist and psycholinguist operate are not capable of implying statements about teaching. Attempts to use linguistic analysis as the basis for teaching reading have produced the full range of programs — from paragraph reading to single-sound variations. The linguist's entire theoretical preamble in other words is nothing more than an appeal used to sanction the opinion of one who is usually not in a very good position, in terms of experience and interest, to make pronouncements any more credible than those of a layman.

The verbal/non-verbal dichotomy

Educators who turn to models of how children learn, often draw spurious distinctions between verbal and non-verbal skills. *The distinction arises because those who set up the tasks in a program do not follow the procedure of specifying the type of test which will be taken as an indication that the child has learned the skill being taught.* These educators do not; (a) state that the objective is to have children learn such skills as sorting objects according to various criteria, and then (b) specify precisely the type of test that will be given the child. Instead, they take a short circuit. They specify that the objective is to have the children demonstrate such skills as being able to sort objects, and then they classify the activity of object sorting in some rationally-derived category. They may conclude that block sorting is an activity that involves visual-motor associations, or something of the sort. *Thus, since object sorting is a non-verbal activity, they proceed to treat the task as a non-verbal task.* They conclude that the task is non-verbal simply because it contains non-verbal components. If they had been more precise in the way they set up the objectives, however, they would have seen that this task cannot be legitimately called a "non-verbal" one, because the test to be administered contains "verbal" (or auditory-language) components. The child is given directions, "Put the blocks that are blue over here . . . Put the blocks that are big over here . . ." and so forth. If the program is to teach the child what he must know to handle the criterion task, the program must provide for teaching the behavior demanded by the auditory signals presented in these statements. When the criterion problem is used as the basis for analyzing tasks, it becomes apparent that the child must have both the non-verbal awareness of the rules or operations in the problem and the understanding of how these relate to specific language signals.

If the task is treated as a non-verbal task, the verbal components may not be taught. The teacher may use language in an incidental manner and never test the child to see whether he understands the language she uses. She may conclude lastly that the child's inability to handle the task indicates that he needs new practice in object sorting.

Another off-spring of the verbal, non-verbal distinction is the teaching presentation that is *merely consistent with a particular concept.* Simply because a presentation is consistent with a particular concept does not mean that it is capable of teaching the concept. The teacher may present a ball and say, "this is red." While her statement is true and is "consistent" with the concept she is trying to teach, it is also consistent with the interpretation that *red* is another name for the object she is presenting. Instead of calling it "ball," we'll now call it "red." Unless the teacher takes further steps to demonstrate clearly what *red* means (and not by having the child sniff an apple or mix Kool-Aid her presentation is incapable of consistently teaching the concept. Again, the failure to devise presentations that are consistent with one and only one concept — presentations that can be failed for one reason and only one — stems from a failure to consult the criterion of performance and evaluate *precisely which steps must be taken, which discriminations must be made, and what kind of language learning must be achieved in the process.*

The case-history approach

Although case-history information may be useful to the school administrator and may be of interest to the educator in his role as an informed citizen, this information is irrelevant to him in his role as a teacher or curriculum developer. Case-history data simply does not translate into statements of what the child knows and does not know. Statements about the home do not translate into what the child has learned. The fact that a child plays on a dirty floor tells the teacher nothing about how the child will perform on a specific criterion task. The test of case history information is simply this: would the information lead the teacher to change one single element in the way she would appraise the child's repertoire of relevant skills or teach new concepts? It would not.

The case-history approach provides the educator with an inexhaustible number of options. It is possible to find causes for failure in the case histories of every child alive. By the time a child has reached the age of four, he has been traumatized and frustrated. He may have had illnesses, toilet training traumas, perhaps even a difficult birth. It is therefore always possible *after the fact* to explain "why" a child failed. But the type of "why" used in case history analysis does not translate into statements about what the child has been taught. There is nothing unique about a child who fails in school *except that he has not learned skills that are used in the instructional setting.* Furthermore, all of the information in the world about the child's history, his personal needs, and his problems does not imply educational remedy. For there to be educational remedies, the child's difficulties must be expressed in terms of what the child does not know, and this lack of knowledge must be evident in the classroom.

Educators rely heavily on case history data because the case-history approach is consistent with the notion that the child is an individual and that education must meet his individual needs. This contention is only partly true. The teaching process has as its goal absolute standards of performance on criterial tasks. The child who indicates that seven times one equals one is not performing up to the standard. His responses ,his individual difference in this area, cannot be accepted. So it is with behavior problems. If a child's classroom behavior is unacceptable and interferes with his learning and the learning of the others in the class, his individual needs cannot be accepted. His behavior must be changed. In short, education is not designed to satisfy the individual needs of the child, if by "needs" we mean a childs' desire to express himself in his own way or behave in his own way. The entire process is geared to make him behave in a conventionally acceptable way both in handling concepts and in conducting himself in the classroom. The aim of the process in conformity (even when the criterion is expressed as divergent tasks, that is, tasks for which there is more than one correct answer) and there is no way to have education without having conformity. Granted there are extreme differences in the type of rules to which conformity is demanded, but the process is generally one of modifying behavior to meet specified standards and not standards that the child selects.

The individual differences the teacher should deal with are differences in what children have been taught. When the teacher is provided with information about what the children have been taught, she can individualize instruction and begin teaching each child what he must learn, starting on *his* level and working up. Unless individual differences are limited to differences in what children have been taught, however, the teacher may use platitutdes about satisfying the particular needs of the disadvantaged, as she provides a combination of poor therapy and poor teaching.

The failure of education to effectively teach disadvantaged children communication skills and to provide them (and their teachers) with a quality education stems from an almost appalling failure to recognize what education is, what it is designed to do, and the "theoretical" limitations that are imposed by the nature of the teaching process. Too many educators are debating about the "aims of education" and borrowing theories from symbolic logic and psychology. They are searching for some kind of magic that will "motivate" the children, or somehow stimulate their "cognitive processes." Too many educators have never seriously considered what teaching is all about. For them, it is a mysterious process in which the teacher somehow stimulates learning.

The effectiveness of the approach outlined in this paper can be attested to by the performance of a small group of children that graduated from the Bereiter-Engelmann kindergarten in 1967 (after two school years of two-hours-a-day instruction). These children, who had entered with IQ's in the middle 90's, averaged 121 in IQ upon graduation. Not one child scored below 103. Consistent gains were achieved in both years of instruction. More important than IQ performance was their achievement performance. Every child read on at least the 1.6 grade level (measured by the Wide-Range Achievement Test) with the average reading level at grade 2.6. The average arithmetic performance was also 2.6. These results were not achieved by giving the children a curriculum loaded with Stanford-Binet type items or with problems similar to those presented on the achievement tests. (In fact, during training the children had never encountered the form of the arithmetic problems presented on the achievement test.) These results are considerably better than those achieved by the first flight of children who finished the two-year preschool-kindergarten training. The improved results were achieved by teaching the children what they had to know to meet specific readings, arithmetic, and language criteria — ignoring their differences as disadvantaged children and concentrating on the differences in what they had been taught and what they must be taught. Instruction was individualized so that every child learned, regardless of how much "natural aptitude" or "readiness" he had, and every child succeeded.

COMMENTARY ONE

by

BERNICE T. CLARK

When I was in Arkansas a year ago I heard a wonderful expression "you all come back again, heah." Thank you for allowing me to participate in this thoroughly challenging conference. As one of the three members from State Education Departments, I am a member of the minority group.

My assignment today is to react to the speech of Siegfried Engelmann our main speaker of the morning. Frankly this is a spot you shouldn't give to a leopard. I am thoroughly familiar with the work of Dr. Bereiter and Mr. Engelmann as described in their book, *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Pre-School.* I respect many, if not all, the points Mr. Engelmann made in his presentation this morning.

That there is a need for a more structured program for all children in the primary grades cannot be denied by any knowledgeable educator. However, I believe Mr. Engelmann contradicted himself many times. He pretended to disregard Piaget's theories of learning which have five main themes: (1) Concern for the continual and progressive change in the structures of behavior and thought in the developing child. (2) The fixed nature of the order in which the successive natures make their appearance. (3) The invariant functions of accommodation and of assimilation that operate in the child's interaction with his environment. (4) The relation of thought processes to action. (5) The logical properties of thought processes.

Mr. Engelmann's program does not disregard Piaget's theories of the importance of continual progress. In other words he takes what he wants from Piaget and throws the rest away.

I have neither the time nor the inclination to quote reams of research that deal with studies concerning the importance of dealing with specific needs of children, because as one leading authority in the field of reading once said, "all educational research is doomed to success." However, Mr. Engelmann seems to ignore the feelings of rejection and alienation that breed hostility and despondency in the child who is not a bona fide member of the dominant culture which, to me, demands consideration in planning any program, any place, any time. Schools can't change the background of students. Schools have to accept this background and change the curriculum.

As a rule, Mexican-American children have a weak self-image. They are descendants of an agrarian folk culture and have grown up in tradition bound homes in which their families have had limited experience in civic affairs, no real sense of social responsibility and a strong tendency to preserve the Mexican culture. Many Puerto Rican children do not speak English but Puerto Ricans in the United States generally have a high regard for education. They see it as a means of raising status.

Disadvantaged Caucasians suffer in "quiet desperation." They usually live in isolation, hidden from sight. Although they have the best opportunity of being assimilated in the dominant culture there is a great need to change their attitude toward education.

Too many Negroes do not acquire a positive attitude toward the value of education because they have been enslaved by all cycles of poverty that perpetuate social tragedy. Failure to properly educate the American Indian is because insufficient consideration has been given to understanding their cultural background.

We have to put all our eggs in one basket marked *motivation* and hatch *achievement*. This requires the cooperation of teachers, parents and pupils.

For two days I have listened to other speakers who agree with the need to better understand the basic culture of all students and the need to develop their self-concept and motivate them to learn. However, I refuse to let this conference end without making a plea for the need for developing the self-concept of teachers and motivating them to learn more about the basic cultures that make up our wonderful democratic society. Teachers are the *key* to improving all instruction. Please don't ask teachers to do for children what nobody seems to be willing to do for them.

Better structuring of the educational program for all children will provide better lines to follow. Mr. Englemann has a program which is a good one, but it is only one *small* part of the total educational program necessary to meet the needs of today's children.

COMMENTARY TWO

by

WALTER G. DANIEL

The paper of Mr. Engelmann addresses itself to some crucial educational issues. Because the author states clear and definite positions, it is possible to give specific responses of agreement and disagreement. There is a temptation to comment on many ideas that would lead to many directions. I have decided, however, to establish my own frame of reference as a way of making a contribution to the total thinking of the group and also of taking back to my own teaching situation some fruitful ideas. We shall limit ourselves to a few major items and indicate our reaction to remarks of some other participants, as well as to Mr. Engelmann, in relation to the overall conference and purpose.

My major professional concern is the improvement of teacher preparation. At Howard University we have been fortunate enough to have received funds, under the Higher Education Act of 1965 Title V, for 26 fellowships in the Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program. Special emphasis is placed upon reaching the disadvantaged. Howard University was active in the formation of CAREL (Central Atlantic Regional Education Laboratory) which is the counterpart of SCREL. We are engaged in several projects, in defining our role and future direction and in searching for innovations for ways of improving the educational provisions for all i.e. both the disadvantaged and the advantaged and for meeting the challenge of change and flexibility. For me, therefore, the conference addresses provide opportunities for comparing concepts and programs. In this frame of reference, I invite you to examine your own professional roles and concerns, to reflect upon your purpose in attending the conference and to project what you may wish to carry back to your own situation.

My essential agreement with the paper is the emphasis upon the need for goal-oriented teaching and the presentation of a model for programming instruction. The suggestions that teachers should establish specific goals for their learners, that the learner is central in education, that the steps or procedures in guiding the learning process should be sequential, that the learning activities programmed should be manageable in and appropriate to the classroom situation, that there should be feedback, that evaluation should include the learning products and relevant outcomes, and that teachers should evaluate or appraise themselves critically are all pertinent, timely, and constructive.

We are impressed by the clearness of thinking, the use of research methodology and the analysis of the fallacies of so much current thinking and many popular misconceptions.

The extreme and dogmatic positions expressed on many topics are unfortunate, however, for they are unsupported. Educators may need to define their boundaries and to program instruction within the limits of their competence, but this process involves decision-making. Teachers of necessity will follow the demands of society, but they must be a part of the professional groups which are seeking change in the environment that conditions their work as guides of students.

I see a danger of creating or extending a social system that divides the school population (students, teachers, administrators) into the rejected (the disadvantaged) and the rejectors (the advantaged). Comments regarding the communication problems of many learners seem to show, consciously or unconsciously, a rejection of the language and communication systems of persons who are labeled "disadvantaged." How do we eliminate the unfortunate connotation of many terms which we now currently use in speaking and writing about the population groups that are different socially and educationally? How may we avoid stigmatizing learners and planning for them on the basis of stereotyping their characteristics and needs? There are subtleties in intergroup and interpersonal relations of which all persons should be aware.

My experiences, observations, research, and reading lead to the conclusion that the characteristics of learners extend over a wide continuum. The ends of the continuum show directions, but they do not provide bases for placing students into discrete categories. The characteristics of learners are individual, varied and changeable. There is great overlapping. Generalizations based upon information or statistical data on the average learner or the median performance are of limited use and application in programming learning.

Care must be taken in assigning to pupils group traits which are not appropriate to them as individuals. We need more research on cultural and subcultural traits and influences. More study needs to be given to the influence of the societal context for schools and instruction. A large segment of the population is caught between a dying social and economic system, and an emerging uncertain one. Learning problems are associated with conditions of social disadvantage. We must remember, also, that all Negroes are not alike and we must avoid using the stereotypes held about them.

The conceptions of the Engelmann approach are narrow. We raise the question: How shall we take into account the broader dimensions of the problems involved in teaching communication skills? The emphasis upon knowledge objectives seems to eliminate the concern and need for objectives in the affective domain. Emotions influence learning and are related to the motivations for learning. The suggestion that there is a single way of teaching is not acceptable. There are many ways of teaching to reach the many types of learners. The rigid steps delineated will have to be adapted for the varieties of learners. The improper application of Piaget's theories by many educators should not lead to a total rejection of them, especially since Engelmann notes that "Piaget's description of the child's behavior in learning are generally quite accurate."

How do we bring about desirable changes? Changes are needed in the environment — in the status quo, in the learners, and in the teachers. Teachers need to look for positive attributes of the culturally different. Too much time has been devoted to a cataloging of their negative traits. If we are to guide their development in communication skills, we must begin with the communication system that lies in their experiences. Further, the environment must reinforce their learning and the school must be concerned with relationships to the environment.

How may we utilize the results of research? The research investigations at the University of Illinois Institute for Research on Exceptional Children have been fruitful for a specific group. Caution must be exercised in extending the generalizations to other groups of different age levels, socio-economic status, community environment, etc.

We are grateful for the provocative discussions of the conference and especially for Mr. Engelmann's paper. We look forward to the contribution of the research in which he is involved, and to further analyses and evaluations of the instructional approaches and curriculum materials from Illinois, and the other efforts underway throughout the nation.

COMMENTARY THREE

by

TISH JONES

In my commentary I would like to stress four points, taking both from the delivery of Mr. Engelmann's manuscript and the reading of his manuscript over the last several days. No one can question the behavioral objectives. Mr. Engelmann's plea must be met if the educator expects to teach the child, and then to know if the child has learned. Behavioral objectives must be specific in order to avoid the global, the haphazard approach to early childhood education, and its resulting slipshod evaluation. I think all of us can testify to this in one program or another that we've seen.

I further agree with him that the elements, or components, of instruction must be broken into parts, at least by the teacher. If she doesn't know what she is doing, how can she do it and how can she know what she has done. We must know the elements to achieve the successful performance of the task. Mr. Engelmann's statement that if a skill, an operation, or a word is to be used in a specific task, it must first be taught, or the child must demonstrate that he already has mastered the task. This is sound, and I think that none of us can really disagree with him; however, I question whether he is including the whole realm of behavioral objectives which are related to communication as children move up through the years. In the manuscript he listed four objectives, or four basic criteria, as stated in performance terms of adequate communication: (1) The child is able to follow basic instructions which are presented verbally or in writing. (2) He is able to construct instructions verbally or in writing. (3) He is able to understand instructions verbally or in writing. (4) He is able to construct descriptions verbally or in writing.

I question whether or not these four behavioral objectives represent all the tasks the children will have to cope with. This view of education narrows when you consider future communication, or did he, in the manuscript, list the beginning four elements? I would view, when I viewed communication skills and behavioral skills, which are necessary, the ability to construct alternative statements, the ability to descriminate between statements, and the ability to explain statements and make decisions. These are communication goals in my book.

Again, on policy makers. Who are the policy makers? Is it the mandate from American society. Who does make the policy? And don't we have a place to play? Don't we have a part?

Mr. Engelmann said he didn't use theory in his manuscript, but he does, and I think it's a sound theory. He does it well. I am in agreement that many people mis-apply theory to justify programs, and it covers up many of the ills that we have in education; however, I do think he applies theory. In fact, his entire program sounds like the application of learning theories somewhat like the programming theory — sequential steps are — (theory). And it's been around awhile. So, I would say this. He does have a theory and I would like to hear more of it and explained a little further.

I fully agree that IQ tests or achievement tests cannot be used exclusively as criterion measures, yet I question his reliance upon Binet scores, and grade level achievement scores as measures of the successfulness of his approach. The question I have is — Did he really raise IQs or did he raise the ability of the children to take IQ tests? This is a question we all have in programs. Will the difference be maintained? What's the next step in his program?

Point four, and I'd really like to fully drive this home. I agree that he has shown results, and Mr. Engelmann has made people think like they've never thought before about concepts, about how you teach your child. He's made us stop and look, and clean up some of our slipshod ways, both in our minds and hopefully, in our actions. But I do wonder if his sample size is large enough to generalize the effectiveness of this method to all disadvantaged, or too maybe, non-disadvantaged children. Are we at this point now that we may say that this is what we must do?

And, finally, because I am a Regional person, and I'm very much involved in this program, I wonder if his sample of children is representative of ours. His mean IQ, as measured on the Binet was about 93. The Binet given to our samples, after a period of time in a day-care school, to account for this adjustment was only 81 point. There is a difference here, and it's a large difference. I can state that in many of our middle class classrooms we'll be lucky to pull a mean IQ of 93. So, I wonder if have an even baser level with which to begin.

Chapter Five

LABORATORY PROGRAMS IN ACTION

EDUCATING RURAL CHILDREN

by

PATRICIA O'REILLY

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory is located in Charleston, West Virginia, and serves the country that was described to you by Mr. Caudill — all of West Virginia, and parts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. One of the problems he described to you has to do with the working man in Appalachia, his problems and his attitude towards work. I'd like to expand just a little bit on his remarks and then describe to you two of the projects that we undertook in Appalachia to try and deal with this transition from the hollow to work.

From what we know of Appalachian people, it would be fair to say that they would fit into most of the cultures of today's world — middle European, Oriental, Eskimo, or Pacific Island culture. They are a people steeped in tradition with heavy emotional ties to their families, and are concerned with today's existence, not with life tomorrow. They place high value on short range people-oriented goals, because these have much to do with daily personal satisfaction. Appalachian people do not seek status or recognition. These are abstract notions of success, which only serve to separate them from the things that are held dear, and the Appalachian society is an adult centered society in which the interests, activities and aspirations of young people are neither recognized, nor nurtured.

A mountain man and his family would fit in with considerable social ease with the Chilean miner, a Tibetian farmer, or a Malayan shop owner. He just doesn't happen to fit with middle class Chicago, San Francisco, St. Louis, New York or Detroit. He doesn't even fit into the middle class pockets of Oak Ridge, Charleston, or Huntsville.

There are two critical reasons for the Appalachian misfits, as Mr. Caudill pointed out. He has a curious detachment from his work, and he has little regard for education. You will note that he is not lazy, or ignorant or lacking in ambition, but he has a different system of values. Strength is in strong family ties and associations. His goals rest in acceptance by the group and participation in the group, and education is a threat to the system. Education gives a man skills, it broadens his vision and it elevates his aspirations. It also takes him away from his family. During the early school years the child can become intellectually detached from his family, especially if his learning exceeds that of his parents or his peers, and as he becomes older, an educated Appalachian boy or girl will move away from the hollow to more plentiful and varied work opportunities.

In the Appalachian experience, then, education drives a wedge between a family and its loved ones. The attitude toward work is based upon the Appalachian's perception of the role of work in man's life. The protestant ethic of work, work hard, save and get ahead, just doesn't make sense to an Appalachian, especially when he can't squeeze in squirrel hunting. Jack Wellon is a preacher and has lived among Appalachian people for most of his pastoral life and he sums up the Appalachian attitude towards work accurately in his book *Yesterday's People.* For the mountaineer, work has never been particularly enjoyable. It was a necessity. He didn't plan to enter a particular kind of occupation because he liked it, he worked at whatever there was to do, because he had to make a living. The concept of choosing a vocation, of becoming trained in that field and traveling wherever it called him, was, and is largely foreign to a mountain boy. The idea that people can actually enjoy work, or that it can be an outlet for creativity, or bring fulfillment, makes little sense to a mountaineer. One works to live and for no other reason. Because work's only purpose is an annual living, the mountaineer when unemployed has a different attitude towards unemployment insurance, from that which the middle class leaders envisioned when they set up such a law. The fact was that this insurance would carry a man over between jobs. The mountaineer, however, sees this insurance as a legal substitute for work for the entire period he's allowed. How often when speaking of a mountain man just after he's been laid off and asking him what he is going to do will you receive the reply, "Well, I don't have to worry none, or look for a job for six months, 'cause my unemployment will be coming in." Since you work for money and you can get it another way legally, why work. And to many middle class persons such an attitude seems almost immoral. Yet, from the viewpoint of the mountaineer it is quite natural and it makes sense.

In middle class America, by contrast, work has been elevated to a position of being almost an end in itself. A man is described by the work he does. He's a drill press operator, or a teacher, or a shop foreman, and he finds the chief meaning of his life in relation to his work. In other words, man is to serve industry and he drives himself ever faster to meet the moving machines. It is almost a case of we live in order to work, while the mountaineer's philosophy is we work in order to live. He feels no responsibility toward work, and there are men who have actually quit their jobs in the city and returned to the mountains, because the factories expected them to be there every day, and when those men took a few days off in the spring for fishing or in the fall for hunting, or if they just wanted to rest for a day or two, the company expressed disapproval. Men are to serve the system, industry seemed to be saying, and that philosophy didn't make sense to the mountain man, and it is still common for a man working in the city to return home to the mountains during times of crisis or death in the family, and not necessarily the immediate family, because of these strong emotional ties. When a cousin, or someone else, not too closely related dies, the man may take off the better part of a week to be present at the funeral. This family duty is so important that even though there is a chance that he may lose his job, he goes home anyway. A young man may take off a number of days to come home to help the family with spring plowing.

On industry's part, this makes the mountain man seem undependable and from the other side, the mountaineer does not understand a way of life which elevates work above what he feels to be real human values. Until the advent of automation the only qualifications a man needed were a strong back, willingness to work, and the courage to face the hazards of mining or timber work. The whole idea of being trained for a job, of getting education in advance of even being on the job market, is quite new. And though it will be difficult, it is necessary for the whole mountain society to shift gears if it's thinking about such training as the age of manual labor disappears. You see then that by operation people who are outside the mainstream of middle class American ways are not really culturally disadvantaged. It would be more accurate to say that they are culturally different. Setting educational goals for mountain children will not be the problem, but bridging the cultural gap between their goals and their value systems and those of the larger American society is the challenge.

Last year the Appalachia Educational Laboratory undertook a major program to smooth the transition from school to work. Its objectives were to increase the holding power of the schools, because the drop out rate in Appalachia exceeds 55 per cent. Another objective was to provide vocational experience, opportunity and guidance to Appalachian youth and to train or develop training programs generally associated with sound vocational planning. Summer job orientation clinics were offered in the summer of 1967 at West Virginia State College which is at Institute, West Virginia, near Charleston, and at Eastern Kentucky University in Richmond. These clinics were offered to rural junior high school boys and girls.

Another objective of the clinic was to demonstrate to the young boys and girls that there were work opportunities, that you didn't have to go to Detroit, or even up to Wheeling, and that there were work opportunities within a 100 mile radius of their home. The objectives of the clinics were to give rural youth some insight regarding technical and service opportunities and to help them acquire some familiarization with the tools, properties, and materials employed in modern business. All the participants lived within a hundred mile radius of the clinic. Their parents could not be college graduates, the parents could not own a business that employed more than three people. A letter in form was sent to each County Superintendent within the 100 mile radius, and he would have to list all the schools in grades nine through 12 in which 70 percent of the students came from communities of 2,500 or less. The letter was then sent to the principal, and he identified the students in his school who were willing to participate. He did it in this manner. We sent him several fact sheets about the clinic and a group of applications. The students had to go by his office to get the application and these were sent in to the Laboratory. The principal or the counselor indicated on the application whether this student would benefit a great deal, just a little bit, or an average amount from these clinics. We divided the applications by sex, and by these other criteria that I mentioned. All students who indicated an uncertain attitude toward attending school were picked to participate in the clinic. All students on whose application the counselor or principal had indicated that this student was a possible drop out for the coming year was included, and I might mention here, that was identified through the criteria of living within a certain radius not having college graduate parents, we identified 16,000 children who could have participated. We had room for only 400. So we could have been in business for a long time conducting the same program just to reach all of the students.

The selected participants were grouped geographically in clusters so that the transportation problems would be minimal and so that vocational counselors could work with them much better, equipping themselves to discuss the occupations and vocational training that was available to the students in their own particular area. A day to day program was designed which would expose the students to diversified activities. These included talks by people from industry coming into the clinic site, field trips, individual and group counseling. The original proposal to conduct the clinics had set as the evaluation procedures very fancy pre-and-posttesting to see if the children gained in occupational knowledge. We had decided on some very sophisticated test procedures, but then it occurred to us that these kids probably wouldn't be able to read very well, and that testing smacks too much of school, and so we asked them to just list at the beginning of the clinic the number of occupations that came to mind and at the end of the clinic the number of occupations that they were able to list.

They were also asked to respond to four of 13 questions. Questions such as: "In the future, will there be more or fewer jobs in which you can use your muscles?" "In the future, will there be fewer or more jobs relating to hospitals and medicine?" "In the future, will machines be doing more or less work?", and "Name the office that you would go to if looking for a job in a plant or a business." These evaluations will be completed during this fall and will appear in Report in Appalachian Advance, but I'd like to share some informal observations of these rural children. Most of them have never been separated from their families, nor have they ever been out of the hollow. Most of them have never traveled on a public carrier, or managed any money. Most of these students entered the clinic with an unrealistic aspiration for the future as evidenced by the frequent check mark against college as a future activity. You will recall that the participants, for the most part, were under achievers with little family income and consequently, little likelihood of ever reaching or finishing college. However, from their own statements at the end of the clinic they showed a more realistic vocational aspiration, such as beauty school, or road construction, or one of the rapidly growing service occupations.

One other project that we undertook this summer had to do with industrial arts teachers. There are so few guidance counselors in the Appalachian Region, that we had to look for an individual in the school who could be the link between the industrial wall and the school, and for those schools that had industrial arts programs, industrial arts teachers seemed to be the likely person. The intention of these summer institutes, where we gathered 60 industrial arts teachers together, was to define occupational information that was essential and had to be taught in the school if the student was to be able to make a real vocational decision, and to demonstrate the techniques by which the teacher could incorporate this occupational information into his lessons.

Most of these teachers were selected in a similar manner. They came from rural schools that had skidding populations. Seventy percent of the student population had to come from communities of 2,500 or less, but we also asked that these teachers fulfill other criteria, that they had to have at least five years remaining before normal retirement, that they had to teach at least 50 percent of their classes in industrial arts, and that they had to present a signed statement from the principal or County Superintendent giving his intent to employ the teacher for the coming year and to continue the industrial arts program. We set two evaluation procedures for this project. One was an evaluation of the teachers to determine their ability to incorporate occupational information into classroom instruction, and the second, an evaluation of the students to determine whether the trained teachers could, in fact, use occupational information in the classroom. We used microteaching as a technique for teaching teachers how to use occupational information and these sequences were three minutes long, at least the sequence that we filmed. The verbal behavior or the teaching behavior of the teacher was plotted on a matrix and it was possible to determine the amount and percentage of time each teacher devoted to essential occupational information. Then, to find out if the students were learning anything after we had trained the teachers, an occupation information test was developed by the Industrial Education Department at East Tennessee State and West Virginia Tech, and this test will be administrered to the students of these teachers, to the sudents of one-third of the group in the fall and another third in January and another third in June.

The Laboratory is quite aware that these two projects were only stopgap measures, and that probably we learned more about what we were supposed to do than having helped the people out there. But we gained considerable insight into the nature of the problem, that is, trying to make a difference in the classroom and I will remind you of the exercise we went through by setting very high goals for ourselves and then reducing them once again to a very meager testing procedure. I would like to tell you that what we think we gained from the clinic wasn't even in the objectives because as we pointed out earlier the Appalachian lives in an adult-centered society, and by in large, each one of these kids had the same reaction to the program. This was the first time that they had been able to talk to an adult. Adults had always been talking to them or at them. It had not been one of our objectives but had we started on the ground floor and worked up, I think we would have been able to build a very sound program.

We agree that these two model programs stand a very good chance of being replicated. The job orientation clinic has been taken over by the community action agencies in our area and they would like to replicate them. The industrial arts program has been submitted for an NDEA Grant by East Tennessee State University to continue next year.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITHIN SCHOOLS

by

WILEY BOLDEN

"Interpersonal Relations Within Schools" is the title of a project that the Southeastern Education Laboratory is currently initiating in 15 elementary and secondary schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, the three-state region served by the Laboratory. The intra-school relations of the principal, the teachers, and the pupils is the focus of this project which is designed to assess the effectiveness of specific patterns of instructional activity in improving these relations. In all the participating schools the principal and teachers will be involved in one of four in-service education programs having overlapping content. And in six of these schools teachers of grades four, five, and six will provide special classroom learning experiences for their pupils. The total number of principal and teacher participants is approximately 400. The total number of pupil participants is approximately 200. The duration of the project as it is presently conceived is the 1967-68 school year.

Before I tell more about this project, I think it would be helpful if I should say something about the larger program of which this project is a part. The Southeastern Education Laboratory was created to bring about a new system of relationships and to introduce a new dynamic system for educational innovation among the region's schools, colleges, and related educational agencies through a program designed to bridge the gap between research and school practices related to the alleviation of educational disadvantages in the states of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.

Recognizing that many educators have the desire and potential to develop more meaningful educational programs but are reluctant to venture in new directions without a strong public consensus to do so, and recognizing that such consensus is unlikely evoked when there is a dearth of well-known concrete demonstrations of productive educational innovation, the Laboratory has taken essential steps for the implementation of a regional plan for continued educational progress. It has established a network of 24 potentially innovative schools that now serve large numbers of the educationally disadvantaged. A demonstration school program is underway in these pilot schools. It is expected that as the program develops, a new system of inter-institutional relationships involving the 24 schools will evolve and be expanded to include as many as 100 cooperating satellite schools, the region's colleges of teacher education and other educational agencies. These inter-institutional relationships will cross conventional geographic lines to form a potentially self-renewing professional community for educational innovation and experimentation.

A Southeastern Education Laboratory pilot demonstration school may be viewed as an experimental school where new methods and materials are evaluated; as a demonstration school where new approaches and techniques are illustrated; and as a model school in which innovations are observed and then emulated by other schools. This eclectic concept is not new to education or to other services, but it is one approach which has not been extensively used in education.

The 24 schools are strategically located throughout the three-state region. The schools differ among themselves, but in common they serve a culture of disadvantaged, possess leadership which expresses a desire to improve educational practices, and manifest potential as catalysts for change in other schools. The schools vary as to level of financial support, level of teacher training, type of community served, and population characteristics. Selection as a pilot demonstration school brings these instructional units into a new system of relationships.

Guided by principles that give importance to such concepts as "willingness and openness to change," "involvement and identification in the change process," "competence and security in the implementation of change," "perceived life-self models for the facilitation of change," and "increased capacity for self direction and self-improvement as goals of change," the Laboratory worked with the 24 schools individually and collectively in formulating an overall design for the pilot demonstration school program based on self-study and analysis in each school.

The focus of this design is two-fold: (1) Attitudes related to the teaching-learning process held by school professional workers, pupils, and parents, and (2) Communication skills — listening, speaking, reading and writing — of pupils. Two primary approaches are involved: (1) the introduction of new motivational processes in the schools to alter the attitudes and understandings of principals, teachers, pupils, and parents, and (2) the introduction of new instructional strategies to improve the basic communication skills of pupils.

Each pilot demonstration school is currently initiating at least one activity involving a motivational process and one activity involving a new instructional strategy. Either of these kinds of activity may have developed from one of two sources: the self-study conducted in the school or a specific project developed by the Laboratory through study and analysis of regional problems and needs. School-based activities, as might be expected, differ from school-to-school in terms of specific objectives, content, and the like, while project-based activities are the same for each school participating in a particular project. For example, "Improving Interpersonal Relations Within Schools" is one of five laboratory-based projects; those among the 15 schools participating in the same phase of the project will engage in some identical activities. All Laboratory activities within the schools, school-based or project-based, are compatible with the overall program design for the pilot demonstration schools.

Implicit in the foregoing discussion are the two ways in which the Laboratory works with the pilot demonstration schools: it assists them in developing and implementing their own programs based on self-study, and it encourages them to participate in projects based on the study and analysis of regional needs when the project activities seem appropriate concerns of individual schools. Thus, the Laboratory simultaneously accommodates both its service interest and its research needs.

Now, this account of the basic program of the Laboratory, of necessity, has been sketchy; hopefully it will foster understanding of what I will now go on to say about the project on Interpersonal Relations.

Rationale

It perhaps does not come as a surprise to you that any serious effort to do something about the quality of teaching and learning in disadvantaged schools would necessarily reflect some concern for improving communication skills and attitudes. Educators have known for some time now that attitudes of teachers toward pupils are significant determiners of the psychological climate of the classroom, and that the psychological climate of the classroom influences pupil adjustment and achievement. More recently, literature on the socialization of the educationally disadvantaged child has increased our understanding of the dynamics of teacher-pupil relations and has suggested the cruciality of teachers' attitudes in the school experience of these pupils. For example, we know that the attitudes of disadvantaged children typically reflect a sense of mistrust and feelings of futility toward environment. And that these attitudes are often reinforced by school experiences that promote frustration of achievement and foster alienation from academic or school-like tasks.

Several of the pilot demonstration schools have proceeded to develop special improvement programs that focus on attitudes. The project, "Improving Interpresonal Relations Within Schools," provides an additional dimension to the pilot demonstration school program — a systematic regional thrust to improve the self-others attitudes of school personnel.

In addition to the perennial significance of interpersonal relations within schools, we recognize that as schools become engaged in stepped up efforts to change, the quality of relations among principal, teachers, pupils and parents becomes an increasingly potent influence on the fluidity of the change process — either serving to accelerate or decelerate its tempo or spread.

The principal, for example, has a major role in creating and maintaining a climate for change, experimentation, and innovation. He must be able to work effectively in groups in order to build confidence and enthusiasm for change and to release the creative and leadership potential of the faculty. Similarly, special demands in terms of interpersonal attitudes and skills are placed on teachers and pupils as traditional approaches are given up for student-centered approaches such as in nongraded instruction and team teaching. Further demands for new patterns of teacher-teacher, teacher-pupil, and pupil-pupil interaction are created by efforts to solve such current school problems as those related to segregation, population shifts and rising enrollments. It is this sort of thinking that supports our involvement in the project.

General Objective

As alluded to in my introductory comments about the project, its general objective is to assess the effectiveness of patterns of in-service education activity for improving principal-teacher, teacher-teacher, teacher-pupil, principal-pupil, and pupil-pupil relationships. Precisely, the objective is to test the effectiveness of four patterns of in-service education activity, each of which consists of one or more components of materials and techniques.

Before going further, let me identify and briefly describe these materials and techniques and then proceed to define the patterns of activity into which they are organized.

Program

The components of materials and techniques or methods that are organized into the four patterns of in-service education activity comprise two specific materials and two techniques or methods. And I should hasten to say that here the distinction between materials and techniques or methods is somewhat arbitrary, since the components referred to as materials involve the use of special techniques or methods, and the components referred to as techniques or methods involve the use of special materials:

(1) *The Human Development Institute Relationship Improvement Program,* sometimes called the HDI, and

(2) *A Teaching Program in Human Behavior and Mental Health.*

The HDI, developed by two clinical psychologists, Jerome Berlin and L. Benjamin Wycoff, is published and distributed by the Human Development Institute through its office in Atlanta. The HDI is a programmed course for the teaching of improved interpersonal relations. It is similar to other programmed devices except that it requires two people working together in interaction one with the other. "In this situation, Rogerian principles of interpersonal relations are taught. Interwoven with the academic instruction are occasions for the two people to begin bringing their new knowledge into a living experience. A variety of special instructions is used which bring the two people into interaction through script reading, role playing, and directed and non-directed discussion. Although this program lends itself to use with group discussions, it is self-explanatory and is for use by two people by themselves." Hence, it is not necessary to provide any special guidance or supervision by an expert or group leader. Completion of the program requires approximately 10 one-hour sessions.

"With this program structure, the HDI seeks to enable the individual to achieve the following specific aims: (1) To deepen awareness of his own feeling and the feelings of others. (2) To enhance appreciation of his own potentials. (3) To become more flexible in both the environmental and cognitive aspects of his behavior. (4) To develop the ability to apply these new behavior patterns of his work setting."

A Teaching Program in Human Behavior and Mental Health, prepared by Ralph H. Ojemann and others in the Preventive Research Psychiatry Program at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, is a course study for grades three to seven including textbooks for pupils, teachers' guides, and related professional materials. The materials and the manner in which they are to be taught are designed to assist pupils to develop a causal orientation toward human behavior. Specific goals are: (1) Understanding of skill in dealing with human behavior. (2) Perception of the teacher as an individual whose real work is that of helping pupils learn. (3) Ability to take initiative in, or responsibility for, trying to work out some of one's simpler problems. (4) Recognition that data from past studies can be an aid in understanding and appreciating the behavior of others. (5) Application of causal approach to historical events and to current social problems.

Further, the *Handbook* and related professional literature provided by the Institute apprise teachers of the crucial importance of pupils' actually experiencing a causal approach in their daily interactions with teachers and classmates. The two techniques or methods are: sensitivity training, and a workshop course devoted to the study and remediation of school based problems of teaching and learning.

Sensitivity training will involve groups of 10 to 15 members of a school faculty under the direction of an experienced leader in tentatively nine two to three hour sessions scheduled through the current school term. These relatively unstructured sessions will provide a climate of maximum freedom for personal expression, exploration of feelings, and interpersonal communication. Expected outcomes are that participants gain conceptual learnings: how they perceive others, how others perceive them, how they enter into a group, how their styles are different from others and how the consequences of these differential styles affect the group. More important, participants gain knowledge and experience about the interpersonal, here-and-now process in which conceptual learnings take place. In general, participants come to know themselves and each other more fully, to recognize and change self-defeating attitudes, test out and adopt more innovative and constructive behaviors, and subsequently to relate more adequately and effectively to others in every day life situations with colleagues, pupils, subordinates and superiors.

The workshop course devoted to the study and remediation of school-based teacher-learning problems is designed to assist teachers in understanding principles of human behavior and learning and their application to situations teachers encounter in their classrooms, particularly as these situations relate to pupil motivation. The basic content of the course will derive principally from issues and problems identified by teachers on the basis of their ongoing classroom experiences. Teachers will receive practice defining and analyzing problems, establishing relevant working hypothesis, developing and implementing courses of action, and evaluating the consequences of the action taken. The course schedule will include a minimum of nine two-and-one half hour monthly sessions. Instruction and guidance will be provided through the services of a specialist in educational psychology.

These four components of materials, techniques and methods — *The Human Development Institute Relationship Improvement Program, A Teaching Program in Human Behavior and Mental Health*, sensitivity, training, and the workshop course — are organized into four patterns of in-service activity, each of which is operative in one or more of the 15 schools. The patterns do not represent a systematic ordering of the four components, but rather gradients of teacher involvement designed to accommodate variations in readiness among school facilities to participate in a project of this nature. The four patterns of in-service education activity are as follows:

Patterns	*Program Activity*	*Participants*
I	Study and completion of HDI	All volunteers among principals and teachers in each of eight schools
II	(a) Study and completion of HDI	(a) All volunteers among principals and teachers in two schools
	(b) Participation in sensitivity program	(b) In each school, a group of 10-15 persons selected from among volunteers who completed HDI
III	(a) Study and completion of the HDI	(a) All volunteers among principals and teachers in each of three schools
	(b) Participation in sensitivity training program	(b) In each of the three schools, a group of 10-15 persons selected from among volunteers who completed HDI
	(c) Guided study and implementation of the *Iowa Teaching Programs in Human Behavior and Mental Health*	(c) Three teachers, one from each of grades four, five and six in each of the three schools; all having participated in sensitivity training program
IV	(a) Study and completion of HDI	(a) All volunteers among principals and teachers in each of three schools
	(b) Participation in sensitivity training program	(b) In each of the three schools, a group of 10-15 persons selected from among volunteers who completed HDI
	(c) Guided study and implementation of the *Iowa Teaching Program in Human Behavior and Mental Health*	(c) Three teachers, one from each of grades four, five and six in each of the three schools; all having participated in sensitivity training program
	(d) Workshop course devoted to diagnosis and remediation of school-based teaching-learning problems	(d) All volunteers among principals and teachers in the three schools

What kinds of evidence will be obtained for evaluating the extent to which the project activities produced significant results? Using self-report measures of attitudinal and behavioral changes and observational techniques to assess behavioral changes the following kinds of data will be gathered:

(1) Evidence of positive changes in self-other attitude of teachers.

(2) Evidence of increased openness of the organizational climate of the school.

(3) Evidence of more acceptant teacher behavior in classrooms.

(4) Evidence of positive changes in self-attitude of pupils.

(5) Evidence of more productive classroom behavior on part of pupils.

(6) Evidence of growth in causal thinking on part of pupils.

(7) Evidence of teachers and pupils perception of specific aspects of the project experience.

Data will be gathered in both the participating schools and in control schools. In addition to testing hypotheses on outcomes in terms of attitudinal and behavioral changes, the data will be examined to determine relations between these attitudinal and behavioral changes, and such variables as teacher personality, and years of teaching experience. Outcomes of the project experience of 1967-68, will serve as a basis for modification and/or development of project activities during 1968-69.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY IN TEACHING THE DISADVANTAGED

by

Robert Hamblin

The earlier speakers have detailed the massive problems in educating a disadvantaged child. They have indicated the kind of community problems there are and indicated the depths in which many people find themselves in our culture at the present time. I probably ought to be bashful, but I shan't. I am not going to detail for you so much the problems, as one method of dealing with them — a method which has been tested experimentally and which works very effectively. The only problem is that it is difficult to apply. It requires a certain amount of training in order to use the method successfully, but nevertheless, it is a successful method. I think you should know about it if you don't already, because you people, perhaps more than any others in this Region, will have the opportunity and the responsibility for doing something about the problems that have been detailed during the conference. You might have an alternate method of handling them, and that is fine, as long as it doesn't waste the taxpayers money, and more important, it doesn't waste the students' time and effort.

I am going to tell you about our laboratory to begin with. As part of the Central Midwest Region Education Laboratory, we have established at Washington University in St. Louis what we call a social exchange laboratory. I call it this because I am a sociologist, a psychologist, and I have to be relevant to my disciplines just as you have to be relevant to yours. I am interested in problem children and working effectively with problem children. We have, in our laboratory classrooms which we have established, *hyper-aggressive* children — children that are so wild and mean they wouldn't be tolerated in a normal class for two minutes. In fact, at five years of age, some of these children have been kicked out of two or three schools already.

We have another class of children who are by far the worst children you could ever imagine. They are *artistic* children. Many of you probably are not familiar with artistic children, but these are emotionally disturbed children, most of them retarded, so that by the time they are six and seven years of age they have the development of a one or two-year old in most areas. They are bright little children, and their only problems are emotional problems, stemming out of the structure of family relationships at home. These little children are completely uncontrollable. We've been studying and working with techniques, and testing them experimentally in an effort to train these little children so that some of them will be able to go into a normal first grade.

Another group of children that we have been working with are *hyper-active* children. Some of you are probably more familiar with these. They are more common. A hyper-active child, whose just growing is almost impossible to take in a normal classroom, becomes retarded also, and is an educational problem. They usually end up in a special school district with two teachers to a half dozen children. They are usually heavily drugged so they are about half-conscious. But they do learn a little.

Another group that we have, located by the notorious Pruitt-Igo housing project, is a class of 22 little four and five-year old Negro children who came from the worst slums in St. Louis. We designed a new system for working with them. I am happy to report that without any coercion, without any punishment, and without any urging of the parents to get them there, at the end of the year we had 22 children. In fact, the parents complained that their children bugged them too much about getting to school on time. So the systems that I am going to tell you about apply.

We used the same basic system with all of these children, and it worked. The hyper-aggressive children in three months were more cooperative, more polite, and more industrious than any middle class children. They were just nicer children, when in the beginning they were horrible monsters.

I would like to tell you about the basic system we used. Then I want to tell you a little bit about our experiments with the culturally deprived children in the class by the Pruitt-Igo Project. The basic system we used is based on the notion that children are problem children for two reasons; not because they themselves have anything wrong with them, but because it is always the system as far as we are concerned. The system motivates the kids to be bad, or it fails to motivate them to do good. I say that in black and white terms. Essentially, the reasons that disadvantaged children do not learn in your schools is simply because you do not motivate them to learn. If you had a different and better system for motivating them to learn, they would learn. We had a group of upper middle class children in one of our schools who, at the end of the year, tested out in the genius class. They had IQ's ranging upwards from 138. We don't know how high they were, because the Stanford-Binet test that we used stopped at 149. That's as far as it was reliable, and they were up somewhere beyond that, perhaps four or five dozen of these children. We had these children on the same system at the beginning of the year, and they scored much lower. In fact, some of the children made an increase of over 35 points.

The point I am trying to make is that these were brilliant upper middle class children who had every advantage in their homes. Compared with that little group of 22 children by the Pruitt-Igo Project on the system that I am going to tell you about, it was hard to tell the difference between the two groups. Some of the little Negro children that came from culturally deprived homes were unmeasurable on the I. Q. test. At the other end, the average was around 75. These little children responded, and they learned. Unfortunately the two programs were not precisely the same, and we did not get all the same measures. Therefore, we aren't able to show you in black and white the comparative progress of the two groups in quantitative figures. My impression was that there was not much difference. The children in both groups were well behaved, were interested, were working hard on their academic subjects, and they just loved school. Now, the system.

If I wanted to shock you, I would tell you essentially that we pay our children to go to school. We do. We pay them, but not in the way you would. You pay people in a bad way, based on a wage system which we have in our country. We used modern learning theory that was developed on rats and pigeons first and validated for human beings, and we used reinforcement. We set up a structure exchange in our laboratories, so that when a child behaves appropriately, he studies or he talks or whatever he is doing according to the program that he is in — he gets paid in a way that's meaningful to him.

Middle class children ordinarily get paid in a way that's meaningful to them in our school. They make friends with the teacher, and the teacher's approval is a pay-off to them. They go home, and if they've done well, the parents whom they love praise them. There's an incentive that is meaningful to them, but not for the lower class children. So we establish one, and we make it meaningful.

What we do is establish a token system of little plastic discs that are just like money. As the child does something that he wants, or that we want him to do, something that's according to the educational objectives of the program that he is in, he gets one of these little plastic discs, not the end of the day, not at the end of the semester, but immediately when he does it and that is the crucial point. Immediate, reinforcement. What happens is that he starts doing it again. After 15 or 20 minutes, at least in the beginning, we have what we call a "shop period" — a period in which he can spend the tokens that he has earned the 15 minutes before. In some of these instances there are 12 tokens for admission to a movie, four tokens to sit on the floor, six tokens to sit on a chair, and 12 tokens to stay on a table, or ten tokens for juice and crackers. You people probably have this for your young grades. We don't just give it to them on a goal system like you do. We charge them. Six tokens for a glass of juice, two tokens for each cookie and they can eat all the cookies they want to earn. When it comes time for recess, we don't have recess, we have a nature walk. We don't have enough money in our schools as yet to have a good playground, so the teacher goes out for a nature walk with them. But they don't get to do that free. You people dole it out to these children. Children love recess. What happens is that the children pay 10, 15, or 20 tokens, or whatever the going price is that day to go out for recess. They work hard to be able to go out for recess.

When the time comes that motivation is lacking, we have a "shop period." We buy little wholesale, cheap toys and they will pay 10, 20, 40, or 50 tokens for them. They go home proud. Even the middle class children go home proud. They've earned some little doll that you probably couldn't get a cent for and they've earned it for twenty tokens. They play with that in preference to their five dollar Kiddel Dolls or whatever, because they've earned it.

Now, you say you shouldn't pay people to learn. You say people should learn because they want to. That's right, they should, and if it's desirable, they will learn. They learn for a right reason. In the beginning when a child is not learning, he can be induced to learn under a proper material reward system and he will learn and learn fast. Our upper middle class children will learn three times as fast as your upper middle class children. We have run these experiments. When the hyper-aggressive children on the usual system were compared after they had been well socialized and were on a token exchange system for learning, they learned 10 times faster. The more problematic the children, the faster or the greater the differential.

With the artistic children the token exchange isn't as powerful as it might be. They were too retarded to even have that kind of exchange work effectively, so we used food. When we have them on a food exchange, it is just as crude as it sounds. They would say a word and we would give them a bite of food. That is the way they get their food. If they don't talk, they don't eat. We take it at very gradual stages we have had to find. If you push children too hard, even for food, they'll become Mahatma Gandhi and go on a hunger strike. You don't have all the power you might seem to have. The point is that you have to find for the particular problem child a reinforcement that is meaningful for him. Once you've done that, then if you make up a reinforcer contingent on his behaving properly, he will behave properly and what is more, he will enjoy it.

How many of your upper middle class children who fall down in the bathroom and gash their head say, "I won't be able to go to school tomorrow?" How many of your upper middle class children ever do that and how many of your culturally disadvantaged children would come to school every day? The biggest problem we had by the Pruitt-Igo Project was that they came too early and stayed too late. These are the kind of problems that we had. It isn't always that way. When we started our project by Pruitt-Igo, we had 22 children show up and it was pandemonium. About two-thirds of the children ran around. We had middle class teacher types that came from Webster College, Washington University, and most of them were in teacher training. We had one lower class or working class Negro woman who had high school training and had been in a Headstart Program. Then here were the little Negro children running around. We did not have a principal that would spank them. We do not use punishment in our schools. We shock people when we tell them that. It was pandemonium. They ran around, fighting, cussing, doing everything but what they were supposed to do. The other third sat as though they were scared to death.

The teachers who were going to teach the token-exchange system did not want anything to do with it. After two weeks of it, they came to us and said, "Would you please do something, would you help us out?" At that point we stepped in. We taught them the basic principles of structuring an exchange that would motivate the children to do work, and how to ignore undesirable behavior. When a child engages in problematic behavior in school, it is very likely he wants to get the teacher. He knows what is going to upset the teacher, and he is reinforced when that teacher gets angry.

Sometimes, with middle class children, you can tell them and get sublimation, but with real problem youngsters, the best way to really get together is to be calm. That is what happened with the teachers at the Pruitt-Igo Project. We taught them to do something they didn't believe in. Our teachers were trained that when one child would be mean to turn their backs on him and start working with a couple of children somewhere else. They would pass up the children and say, "Thank you Johnny." Soon the child realizes that he isn't making any headway. Then he comes over, joins the group, and starts earning tokens. That's the way it works. It took only ten days in that school before those children were model youngsters. They were not fighting anymore. They were not running around. They were sitting at the table learning.

The real serious problem in the school, that I haven't mentioned yet, was the fact that there were seven little children who were so timid that they would not even talk. Nothing the teacher would do could get them to talk. The teacher would ask them a question. They would shake their heads 'yes' and 'no' sometimes. Once in a while they would utter a quiet word that you could hardly hear. We decided to do a special experiment with these seven children. We took the teacher who had been with Headstart to work with these children for a two-week period using the regular token exchange that we had set up for the rest of the classroom. We found that during this time these children were talking on the average of about eight percent of the sample period. These were 15 second periods. We would watch a child if he said anything during one of these sample periods, and we would mark it down. This means that during eight percent of the 15 second sample period, they said something like, "Uh-huh," or something similar. That was our base line with the children — never any sentences, never more than a single word, and then so quiet you could hardly hear it. That was the first period of their first speech. We then told the teacher every time that a child says anything, we didn't care what it was, give the child a token. As the rest of the class was going through their 15 or 20 minute earning period and having a paying period where they bought something, these youngsters were just working on talking. The teacher would say, "Hello, little girls and boys. How are you this morning?" They wouldn't say a thing, and she would say, "Oh, please you know what to say. Hello, Mrs. Phillips." Finally one of them would say it, and she would give him a token. Then another one would get a token. It was like pulling teeth the first try, but almost from the first day the rate of talking increased and leveled off to where they were talking during fifty percent of the sample times.

To give you an idea, an average child in preschool will talk 42 percent of the sample. These children weren't just talking. They were talking at a higher than average rate, but the quality of the conversation was still single words and very short phrases. They weren't very spontaneous. Where they might say one word in a sample period, a normal child might say six sentences.

Whenever we sent in a new system we let it approbate — steady out to get the effects. Then we always do something. What happened here is, instead of being with Mrs. Phillips, these children were transferred to a new grade with Mrs. Jones. They went through another *A* period where they were on the token exchange. It was the same token exchange as the rest of the youngsters, nothing special for talking, just for giving the right answers. This time there was a drop in their rate of talking, and it leveled out at about 23 percent. Now notice they didn't go all the way back did they? In the next period with this new teacher, we taught her how to reinforce the children for talking. She used the same procedure as Mrs. Phillips. What happened? This time there was an immediate jump. It leveled off at about 60 percent. Only there was a difference. Now the children were beginning to talk to one another. They were beginning to use sentences. In fact, they were talking so much during those periods that they began to be a problem. At the end of that sixth two-week period, we let them steady out, and gave them to a new teacher, Mrs. Smith.

In the *A*-three period an interesting thing happened. This time they didn't drop all the way back. In fact, they dropped to about 50 percent and just stayed there. They were talking more than normal children. They were talking in sentences like normal children. Their speech was still a little more broken than a normal child, but they were talking and at a higher rate. We came back during four months to watch these children, and under the standard conditions that we used, they maintained the rate. They didn't need reinforcement anymore. By installing these artificial exchange systems which reinforce the children as they developed their ability to talk, it became less costly for them to talk. Just the natural reinforcers in the situation was enough to maintain a talking pattern once it was well established. We've found that is the way it is generally with the systems we designed. If you take a problem child and work with him for a year or two years, soon he will get to the point that he loves talking, he loves school, he loves whatever you're working on so much that he'll do it anyway for a lot less pay than we start with. In fact, if you put him on a normal system, he will do just fine.

I would like to say that I have over-simplified things in this presentation to some extent. It isn't as easy as I have made it sound. We have learned how to train teachers and therapists to use this kind of a system in relating to children. After explaining the system thoroughly and the theory behind it and letting people do a certain amount of reading, we let them watch a competent teacher in operation for two or three hours. There will be a trainer there who will be explaining what this teacher is doing and pointing out, "Now, look, Johnny's left the table." We don't ever say anything to Johnny when he leaves the table. Now watch what the teacher does. The teacher might just ignore him completely. Johnny goes wandering off. She keeps working with the other teachers, and pretty soon Johnny comes back. She makes a fuss over him as he comes back. It turns out that over a period of two or three or four days, she will see Johnny less and less frequently getting up and wandering away. She will see how to handle different situations. Then, she is put into the classroom with the other for a half hour or so, and we coach her. We have one way mirrors that we can see through and the children can't see us, and a communication system so that the teacher can hear what we say. She has a hearing aid. The children think she's probably deaf. We have learned that we can only do two things. One is, when she doesn't know what to do, we say, "Well, you might turn your back on that child, or you might go over to Clara and give her a token. She has been working hard." We will give suggestions when she obviously doesn't know what to do, or if she has done something particularly well, we'll say, "Great, that's good." We just give her positive reinforcement, verbal approval, and suggestions, and she knows what to do. In a period of about six hours of this, they love the coach, they love the system, and they work it about as well as anybody else. They will have regressions, and they will need to come back and work and be coached. They have a chance to talk with someone who knows what he's doing, talk over problems, how it should have been handled, and so forth. They are then on their way. They can handle this kind of a system and do it very effectively. I don't know of anybody that's ever done it on their own however.

It's good to know about this system, I think. Our artistic children are getting better. Our culturally deprived children learned how to talk. Our hyper-aggressive children became good, cooperative students and stopped being aggressive. The parents of our artistic children were trained how to be assistant therapists. They work with the children at home, and are having a great time. Their life has changed from a nightmare to one of real pleasure. I didn't tell you we even had some little two-year olds in that upper middle class group that I mentioned. We did an experiment to see if, given an adequate motivation system, two-year olds could learn to read as fast as five-year olds. Neither one of them is supposed to learn how to read according to the present educational theory, but we tried. They both learned to read. There wasn't much difference between the two-year olds and the five-year olds when they were adequately motivated. This coming year we plan to use the same system. The Board of Education of the St. Louis Public Schools has given us a class of 26 disadvantaged youngsters who have gone through kindergarten, but aren't ready for first grade according to traditional measures. We're going to teach them how to read this year using our new techniques and our system of motivation and we are hoping to have them for three years. This is the primary system of your primary school system that they have there, and we are hoping that by the end of the three years they will be the outstanding children in the St. Louis Public School System.

There are many problems in our phases, but we take chances all the time. We did when we took the artistic children, having never seen one before. Now we're going to train people how to teach them according to our theory. We did with the hyper-aggressive children and with the culturally deprived children. We live with chances every day in our Laboratory. We have the responsibility as the "haves" to do something for the "have nots," the unhappy and the miserable. We have that responsibility and it is education that has a chance of really doing it. It is education that has transformed this world. What was the United States 60 or 80 years ago? It was a third rate country. Do you know what we did in this country? We passed a series of College Laws, in which public universities were established and supported by tax money. In the years that followed, engineers, teachers and agricultural workers were trained and this country was transformed into the greatest country in the world, economically and educationally. We spent the money and now that system is a great system. The only problem with it is that it has not worked for certain pockets of our population. If we can devise a system that is effective for them, it will do for them just what our present education system has done for this country. Yours is a holy trust, and I am sure by the very fact that you are here that your days will not be spent earning money, they will be spent trying to be worthy of that holy trust and doing something for those who need it in this country.

APPENDIX

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

N. A. Adams
Andy Aldridge
L. S. Alexander
Roy Allen
D. C. Andrew
W. P. Bass
Evalena Berry
Frankie Bethea
Leon Billingsley
Augusta Boatright
Collin Bowen
Charles Bruning
Kermit J. Burkhart
Kulinn Carse
J. T. Castleberry
Sam Clements
Raymond Cleveland
Jim Craigmile
Don Davis
Joe Doerr
Mary Doud
Ruth Edgington
Fritz H. Ehren
Amanda Elzy
H. F. Evans
S. R. Evans
Enoch Florence
John Fortenberry
C. L. Madden
Marie Marcus
Ralph McCallister
Alma McCullough
C. A. McCullough
Wendell McCune
Norman McRae
Sister M. Michele, OSF
Joe Miller
Earl Moore
L. H. Moore
Sarah Moore
Clarence Morris
Dolly Moseley
L. F. Newport
Malcolm O'Leary
Lonnie Parrish
Floyd Parsons
T. E. Patterson
Lowther Penn
Robert W. Plants
Milton Ploghoft
Betty Poolman
G. Pat Powers
James D. Prescott
Willie Price
Robert R. Rath
Victor Ray

James Gartman
Thelma K. Gate
Phyllis Giles
W. L. Giles
Austin Glenn
Jean Gordon
Harriet Guthrie
Martin A. Hagerstrand
J. L. Hallford
Richard Hardie
Veralee Hardin
John Harold
B. W. Harrison
Larry L. Havlicek
Larry K. Hayes
W. L. Hearn
Betty Hollowell
A. Eugene Howard
Rees L. Hughes
J. W. Hull
Joe D. Hurt
Maciel Jackson
Charles Johnson
Eugene Johnson
J. B. Johnson
William D. Johnson
Sister Kathleen, OSF
Gus Kelter
D. L. Kennedy
Henry D. Kimmel
Emmett Kohler
Jeanne Lagrosse
O'Fredia Lewis
Walter Liston
Frank L. Lovell
Annie Lowery
Jack T. Lynn
Roy Shaver
Ginevena Reaves
Bertha Redfield
Vera R. Rhodes
Cathron Robinson
Forrest Rozzell
M. H. Russell
Ralph Scott
Anne Semple
Clifford Shenk
Doland Shire
Reginal Sims
Joe Slaven
Doris Smith
Emmett Smith
Bert J. Stark
Ernestine D. Talbert
Ora Tallent
Carole Taylor
Cleopatra D. Thompson
Lillian Tobias
Roy Trout
Delma Turner
Mildred B. Vance
Tommy Venters
William R. Van Zandt
Pete Walker
Walter Washington
J. H. White
Danny Whitefield
Burney Whitfield
H. E. Williams
Mildred M. Williams
Nan Williamson
Leon Wilson
Becky Yeatman
Harry L. Young
Pat Youngdahl

SCREL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS
M. A. Hagerstrand, *President*
Mack E. Barham, *Vice President*
S. R. Evans, *Secretary-Treasurer*

MEMBERS
Mr. Herbert McAdams, President
Citizens Bank of Jonesboro
Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401

Mr. W. F. Rector, President
Rector-Phillips-Morse
312 West Capitol Avenue
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mr. Bennie Ryburn, Sr., President
Ryburn Motor Company
Monticello, Arkansas 71655

Dr. W. E. Darby
President and Chriaman of the Board
National Old Line Insurance Company
P. O. Box 2900
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Dr. Rees H. Hughes
Kansas State Legislature
2007 South Elm Street
Pittsburgh, Kansas 66762

Judge Mack E. Barham
Fourth Judicial District Court
Ouachita Parish Court House
Monroe, Louisiana 71201

Mr. Henry G. Taliaferro
Three Rivers Gin Company
Jonesville, Louisiana 71343

Dr. R. C. Cook, President
South Eastern American Life Ins. Co.
P. O. Box 1589
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

Mr. S. R. Evans
P. O. Box 496
Greenwood, Mississippi 38930

Dr. R. W. Harrison, Jr.
P. O. Box 356
Yazoo City, Mississippi 39194

Mr. Robert D. Morrow
Brandon, Mississippi 39042

Mr. H. F. Evans
Evans Drugs, Inc.
Neosho, Missouri 64850

Mr. Jack Grimmett
Pauls Valley National Bank
Pauls Valley, Oklahoma 73075

Colonel M. A. Hagerstrand, U.S.A. (Ret.)
720 West Shawnee
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Mr. Philip McKinzie, Vice President
Durant Bank and Trust Company
P. O. Box 130
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

SCREL PROFESSIONAL STAFF

ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Gwen Nelson
Executive Director
Mrs. Marilyn Leopard
Administrative Assistant
C. L. Perry
Assistant Director for Operations
James F. Lloyd
Assistant Director for Communications

PROGRAM AND RESEARCH

Dr. Floyd G. Delon
Associate Director for Research
Dr. A. K. Nelson
Research Specialist
Dr. Tish Jones
Resource Specialist
Dr. Rudolph V. Green
Senior Program Specialist
Dr. Florence McCormick
Program Specialist
Dr. William H. Sipes, Jr.
Program Specialist